

P O M P A I A

Διςτομος Ὁξεία 14

OR

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

DEFENDED

In two treatises against the
Fabulous and Slanderous Imputa-
tions cast upon her in those
two Points.

OF { Succession of Bishops
and
Schisme

Wherein

The Fable of the Nags-head Ordination is detected,
And
The Accusation of Schisme retorted.

By *John Bramhall* D. D. Bishop of *Derry*

Psal. 56. 5.

*Filii hominum, dentes eorum arma & sagittæ : & lin-
gua eorum gladius acutus.*

Ψαλ. 55. 15.

Ἡ ρομφαία αὐτῶν ἐισέλθοι εἰς τὴν ἀρτίαν
αὐτῶν.

Printed at the *Hague*, and Published at *London*, 1659.

ALABAMA

1860

CHURCH

TO

AND

DISCIPLES

THE

OF

THE

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF



THE
PUBLISHER TO THE
READER.

THis Book runs the Fate which others seldome meet with in some respects, whereof one is, that it is Printed in one place, and Published in another: And though this be a thing which would not need any Preface, yet some other things there be that will, which the Reverend Author, having referred to the Publisher, to give an accompt of to the Reader; he may be pleased to receive in this following Advertisement.

The Book was both Written and Printed beyond Sea; But the Materialls upon which a good part of the former Treatise consisteth, were such, as no place but

To the Reader.

England could afford, being either matter of Testimony from Persons of Honour, and others that live here; or of Record in our Publick Offices and Registries; Which being then a gathering while the Authors Pen was a writing, and the Printers hand a working, made them come sometimes more slowly than otherwise had been requisite.

I may instance in that Honourable Attestation given by the Lords Temporal to the Bishop of Duresmes Protestation; and by it to the cause it self. (Printed here, chap. 2. p. 22, 23.) which hath been subscribed already by fifteen Lords, most of them of the prime Nobility, though no more than nine of them are named in that place; because no more than those nine had then subscribed it, when that sheet was Printed off. It hath alwaies been the Honour of the Nobility to Protect the Church, defend the Truth, and relieve those that are wronged: And God forbid that any of these Noble Persons, that have so freely and readily concurred in all these

To the Reader.

by this Attestation, should want the return of that acknowledgement which is justly due to them for it. Let the Reader therefore take notice that of these fifteen, two of them are the Marquesses of Hartford, and Dorchester: Eleven of them are Earls, viz. The Earl of Lyndsey, Lord high Chamberlain of England; together with the Earls of Rutland, Southampton, Lincoln, Devonshire, Manchester, Berkshire, Cleveland, Monmouth, Dover, and Newport: and the other two are Barons viz. the Lord Willoughby of Parham, and the Lord Lovelaces.

For the other Attestation from the Lords Spiritual, there needed no more to be said than what is in the Book; if the Printer had not carelessly left out three of their Christian names; which being usually prefixed to their Titles in the subscription of Bishops (though not alwaies of temporall Lords) may perhaps afford our Adversaries a new occasion of quarelling for such an omission; now that all materiall exceptions are so ab-

To the Reader.

solutely cut off from them for ever. To prevent this, be it known to them, that it is subscribed by William Bishop of London (who was then Lord high Treasurer of England) William Bishop of Bath and Wells, Matthew Bishop of Elie (then Dean of his Majesties Chappell-Royall) Robert Bishop of Oxford, John Bishop of Rochester, and Bryan Bishop of Sarisbury (then Tutor to his highness the Prince of Wales,) all of them persons of much worth, great integrity, and reveren'd Estimation; and therefore not onely likely to know, but unlikely to deny, if there had been any such passage in that Parliaments.

*Beside these, there is a third Attestation likewise annexed to the Bishop of Duresmes Protestation, from the Clerk of the Parliament and his two Assis-
tents; who attended in the House continually, to observe and record whatsoever was there debated: and therefore could not be ignorant of such a passage as this is pretended to be, if any such had really been. The reverend Author
thought*

To the Reader.

thought not fitting to print it, though he had a true Copy of it, because it was not then subscribed, by reason of the absence from this place of some of the subscribers: But to supply that defect, the Reader may now have it in these following words.

We whose Names are hereunto subscribed, being Clerks in the Honourable House of Peer's, during the Parliament begun at Westminster the third day of Nov. 1640. whole according to our severall places & offices, did give continuall attendance in the said House; and as our duty required did respectively, and particularly observe whatsoever was debated and concluded in it: Do hereby testifie and declare, that to the best of our knowledge and remembrance, no such Book was presented to that Honourable House: nor such Speech made in it, by the Reveren'd Bishop of Duresme, or any other, as are mentioned and disavowed in his Lordships Protestation and declaration here prefixed. And therefore
we

To the Reader.

we have freely and voluntarily given this our Attestation for the confirmation of the truth, of what is affirmed and declared by the said Bishop in his said Protestation. In witness whereof, we have herewith set our hands: Dated the 27 day of December, Anno Dom. 1658.

*Jo. Brown Cleric. Parliamentorum.
Jo. Throckmorton.
Sam. Smith.*

What can our Adversaries say to this? If they suspect the memory of all these Clerks, they may be satisfied by Mr. Scobel's Certificate out of the Journall of the House (here Printed, p. 23.) If they say such a thing there was, though it be not recorded, they may be silenced by the contrary practise of the House; together with the Testimony of all these sworn Officers, & the Memorials of some of them in Scriptis, out of which the Journall of the House was daily completed.

Wherunto

To the Reader.

Whereunto may be added that the Bishops who subscribed that Attestation (being so nearly concerned at that time) were so diligent in the House, as that for instance, one of them was absent but one day; another but two, while they sate in Parliament; and the rest as seldom as their other weighty occasion would permit: And some of them have their own private memorials still by them of all that passed, and therefore gave no blind testimony to what they here subscribed..

In brief, the untruth is so palpable, that the person, who was the Instrument in gathering almost all these subscriptions, will depose it upon oath, if need require, that he never used any sollicitation, or perswasion to any person, (whether Lord, or Bishop, or Clerk) to subscribe, but onely proposed it to their consideration, and that thereupon they did all willingly subscribe it (as many as he proffered it to) and with very great detestation of that notorious slander which first occasioned it.

We

To the Reader.

We may therefore very reasonably presume, that most of the temporal Lords, who then Sate in Parliament, would most willingly have attested this manifest truth, if the thing could with any convenience have been represented to them. But seeing they live so dispersedly all over England, and withall that so many of them have subscribed as (with the Bishops and Clarks) will make up the number of a double Fury, it was thought neither necessary nor convenient to be at any further trouble in this business, which had already been proved in such a superabundant measure; but onely to lodge the Protestation with the Attestations annexed in some Authentick Registry, where they may stand upon Record as an Honourable Testimony to the succession of Bishops in the English Church, and a perpetuall brand of infamy to the Inventours and Abettours of this impudent Slander.

*That this is no vain persumption will further appear in that other Lords also (and those of different perswasions) who
have*

To the Reader.

have not seen the Originals of these Testimonials, but onely were made acquainted with them, have notwithstanding utterly disclaimed what our Adversaries pretend, some in Words, and some in Writing.

One instance of the former is the Lord Brudnall, an eminent Roman Catholick, but a person of more conscience and honour than to defend their cause by such indirect courses: and therefore fearing lest any should suspect him to be that Antient Peer (mentioned in this Book. p. 9.) because he is now the Antientest man of any Peer of England, he utterly disclaimed his knowledge of any such passage, in his discourse with Sr. Justinian Isham and Mr. Francis Crawley in July last at Northampton.

Another Instance of the later we have in the Lord Say, in his letter to a Friend, (of Oct. 22. last past) where he saith of that pretended Book and Speech, that he remembers no such thing, but thinks it an invented tale: Nay (more yet) that
he

To the Reader.

he is sure the Bishops were indeavour-
ed to be put out of the House upon an-
other account, and not upon that at all.
*What thoughts his Lordship hath of Bi-
shops, is not pertinent to this question :*
The meaner they are, the stronger will
his testimony be in this cause. If any
such Endeavours had been (as he is sure
there was none) who more likely to
have known and remembred it than he ?
Or who more unlikely now to disclaim it,
seeing he still esteems of the order of Bi-
shops as no other than a Popish device.

As for matter of Record alledged in
this book, it is done with so much fidelity
as (when the Errata's are corrected may
endure the scanning of the most supercili-
ous Aristarchus of the Society; onely
the Reader is desired to take notice, that
in the Register of Archbishop Parker,
Tom. 2. fol. 10. (Whence the Act up-
on the consecration is transcribed,
which is here printed, p. 104, 105.) the
words of the Benediction are recorded
in English as they were pronounced out of
the English Ordinall; and as Mr. Mason
hath

To the Reader.

hath Printed them, though this Reverend Author, hath put them in Latine to make the Record speak all one and the same Language. And therefore the words, p. 105. l. 7. are to be read thus, (to make them answer punctually to the Record) *Dixerunt Anglicè.* Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by Imposition of hands, For God hath not given us the Spirit of Fear, but of Power, and Love, and Soberness.

This Advertisement (I confess) would have been superfluous, if we had to deal with any Adversarys, but such as for want of material exceptions, grasp at every punctillio to cast dirt in the face of our holy Mother the Church of Eng. and have accordingly heretofore concluded a variety (and consequently a forgery) of Registers from some such trivial differences in our Authors as these are; But let them know yet once more that the Register is but one, and that a fair, punctual, compleat, and unquestionable Record, as this
Reveren'd

To the Reader.

Reverend Author hath proved it, and
as it will manifest it self to be to any one
that shall look upon it, without prejudice
when our adversaries have vented all
their malice against it. Which the Father
of Lyes can suggest unto them.

THE

THE
CONSECRATION
AND
S U C C E S S I O N,
Of Protestant Bishops justified.
The BISHOP of DURESME
vindicated.

And
That infamous Fable of the
ordination at the Nagges head
clearly confuted.

By JOHN BRAMHALL,
D. D. Bishop of Derry.

*Neceſſe eſt ut lancē in libra ponderibus impoſitis
Deprimi, ſic animum perſpicuis cedere.*



GRAVENHAGH,

By JOHN RAMZEY,
Anno 1658.

CONSTITUTION

SUBJECT

Of Protestant Bishops in India

The Bishop of Dacca
visited.

and

That infamous Fable of the
ordination of the Nagas had
clearly confuted.

By JOHN BRAMHALL,
D. D. Bishop of Dacca.

Printed in London by J. K. for J. B. R. 1711.



GRANDBRANCH

By JOHN BRAMHALL

1711



A POST-SCRIPT.

Christian Reader: whereas there is mention made in this Treatise, of a Book entitled [*Antiquitates Britannicæ*] Printed first at London in Latine by John Day, the Queens Printer, in the year 1572, and reprinted at Hamnow in the year 1605, he pleased to take notice of these two things.

First, that it is not material to our present Controversie, whether Archbishop Parker himself, or his domestick Chaplain John Joscelyn were the Author of that Book: or perhaps the Chaplein Author of the Archbishops life (as a subject more proper for his Pen than his Masters,) and the Archbishop himself of all the other Lives: This is undoubtedly true, that it was written at the Archbishops charge, and by his appointment, and was approved and
* 2 authorised

Postscript.

authorised by himself, and published to the world three years before his Death.

Secondly, that since the publishing of this Treatise, I have found in the Library of my kind friend Mr. Michael Hennywood, (whom I name on purpose, that they may view it who have a desire) an old Translation (as the character it self doth testifie sufficiently) of the last of those seventy lives, (namely, of Archbishop Parker himself) into English, which doth more concern this cause than all the rest, Printed in the year 1574, that is, two years after the first edition of Antiquitates Britannicæ, one year before the death of Archbishop Parker, thirty years before this *Abusive Fable* was hatched, and forty years before Mr. Masons book was Printed.

Who translated it, and who printed it, is unknown; neither of them durst avouch it. But this is evident by his mistranslations, and by the Title, wherein he wisheth that as Austin was the first, so Matthew might be last, Archbishop of Canterbury, and by his marginal notes every where, as for instance where he scoffeth at our Popeholy Orders that the Translator was a most virulent Adversary both of Archbishop Parker and of the Church of England. Yet notwithstanding his snarling humour, where it is related in Archbishop Parkers life, how he was consecrated by
four

Postscript.

four B'shops according to the Law, and how all the other B'shops during his time were legally consecrated by him; this Rabshkehkeh stands like the picture of Silence in an Heathenish Temple, with his finger in his mouth, and was not able to contradict it, who (you may be sure) would have made good sports with the Nagges-head Ordination, if any such thing had been heard of in those days.

The use I make of this is double, First, it sheweth undeniably, that the Legal consecration of our Protestant B'shops, was published to the world in Print, both in Latine, and English, in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's Reign, and could not be contradicted then by the greatest Adversaries of our Church. Secondly, that the exception which our English Nonconformists in those daies, did take to our Episcopall Orders, was not want of legal Consecration, but legal Consecration it self; upon which ground this Translatour nicknamed them, Pope Holy Orders.

The workes of the Bishop of DERRY.

A Fair warning, or take heed of
Scotch Government. 4.

An answer to Mounser *Millitier*
about the truth of the Church. 8.

A vindication of the Church of Eng-
land from Criminall Schisme. 8

A second vindication of the Church
from Schisme. 8.

Of liberty and necessity against Mr.
Hobbs. 8.

Castigations of Mr. *Hobbs* his last.

Animadversions in the case concer-
ning Liberty and universal Necessity,
with the catching of *Leviathan* or the
great *Whale.* 8.

*All which Books above named, are to be
sold at the Ship in St. Paul's Church-
yard by John Crook.*

CHAP. I.

The occasion of this Treatise.

THe fairest eares of Corne are soonest blasted, so the more conspicuous the Church of England was among the reformed Churches, (as not being framed according to the brainicke dictates of some seditious Oratour, or the giddy humours of a tumultuous multitude, but with mature deliberation, and the free consent and concurrence of all the Orders of the Kingdome,) the more it was subjected to the envie and groundless calumnies of our Countrymen of the Roman Communion: But of all the slanderous aspersions cast upon our Church, that lying fable of the Nagges head Ordination doth beare the bell away. Those monstrous fictions of the Crenian bulles and minotaures, (devised by the Athenians to revenge themselves upon Minos King of Crete, who had subdued them in a just warre, and compelled them to send their sons to him for hostages,) were not more malicious, nor that shameless lie of Kentish long tails more ridiculous. The first deviser of it doth justly deserve the Character of *A*

A

man

man of a brasen forehead and leaden heart. If the unpartial reader after he have perused this treatise, thinke I doe him wrong. I do willingly submitte my self to his censure.

This prodigious fable received its dearest wound from Mr. Masons penne, and hath remained ever since for the space of thirty yeares buried in deepe oblivion. And those assaies which it maketh now to get wing againe, by the assistance of two Ignatian Fathers, are but the vaine attempts of a dying Cause. Neither would I have troubled the Reader or my self to bring *Owles to Athens*, or to confute a Cause which hath bene so demonstratively confuted to my hand, but for two new additions lately spread abroad. The one by orall tradition which concerneth my self. That *Father T. and Father B. had so confuted the Bishop of Derry in the presence of the King, that he said he perceived his Father had made me a Lord, but not a Bishop*, And that afterwards, by my power I had procured those two Iesuits to be prohibited that presence. So that whereas *Father Talbot* used to be the Interpreter in the Spanish treaties, now he was not admitted, and *Don Iohn* would admitte no other.

So the Bishop of Derry is accused not onely to have bene publickly baffeled, but also to have bene a disturber of publick affaires. Yet I know nothing of all this, which concerneth myself. I never heard of any such conference, or any such words, I never knew that Father Talbot was designed to that imploiment. I was never guilty of having any such power, muchlesse of any endeavour to turne out any man. If the Fathers seemed too pragmaticall to those who were intrusted, or to involve the interest of their Religion into Civill treaties, what is that to me? If it were true they may thanke themselves. If it were false, they may thanke them who did it. Whether true or false I never had an hand, nor so much as a little finger in it.

All the truth that I know is this. Hearing that these two Fathers, had spoken largely in the Courte of the Succession of our English Bishops, but never in my presence, I sought out Father B, and had private conference with him about it in the Iesuits College at Bruges, and afterwards some discourse with Father T. and him together in mine owne Chamber. Whatsoever they did say, they put into writing to which I returned them an answer, shewing not onely that there

was not, but that it was morally impossible there should be any such Ordination at the nagges head. From that day to this I never heard any thing of it, that concerned myself. Now if a man should search for an Authour of this fabulous Relation, he shall be sure to have it fathered upon some very credible persons, without names, who had it from Iohn anokes whilest he was living, and he had it from Iohn a Stiles, and he had it from No body, but feined it himself out of a good intention, according to that case Theology which he had learned of Machiavell, *To advance the credit of Religion by all meanes possible true or false.*

The other addition concerneth the learned and Reverend Bishop of Duresme one of the ancientest Bishops this day living in the Christian world, being 95 yeares old at least. That he owned and justified the nagges head Ordination in publick Parliament, in the house of the Peeres; It is very well, we can not desire a better place where to have it spoken, then the house of Parliament. Nor better witnesses then the Lords spirituall and temporall. We have no man of the Episcopall Order, whose memory can reach so neare those times, or in whose integrity we doe more
confide

confide, then the Bishop of Duresme. He might heare many things either from the persons prætended to have bene then consecrated, or from the Notaries or witnesses who were then present at that imaginary Consecration. Or at least he might receive the tradition of that age from such as were eiewitnesses of what passed. Let it be put to his Testimony if they thinke fitte, (without doubt he is the same man he was then) or to the Testimony of any other of his age and Reputation, whom they can produce. We refuse no sort of prooffe but onely vaine *hear say*, which as our English proverbe saith is commonly, and in this case most undoubtedly a lye. Nay we would not refuse the Testimony of Mr. Neale himself, though a professed enemy, who was the onely founder of this silly fable, so he might be examined upon oath, before equall Iudges, but compell him either to shame the divell, and eate his owne words, or to runne himself into such palpable absurdities Contradictions and impossibilities, that no man of reason how partiall soever, could give any credit to him. My first taske shall be, before I meddle with the fable it self to vindicate the Bishop of Duresme, and the truth which is wounded through his sydes, with this intimation.

imation to the Reader, that if this branch of the Legend be proved apparently to be false, which is pretended to have bene publicly acted in a full house of the Peeres of the Realme, we can expect no truth from the voluntary reporte of one single meane malicious enemy, to his own party. And with all a confessed Spie, of what was done at the Nagges head. Breake ice in one place, and it will crack in more.

C H A P T. II.

The Vindication of the Bishop of Duresme.

TO vindicate the Bishop of Duresme, I shall first set downe the relation of this passage in the words of the Fathers themselves.

Treatise of the nature of Catholick faith and heresy c. In the beginning of the late Parliament some Presbiterian Lordes presented to the upper house a certeine booke, proving that the Protestant Bishops had no succession or consecration, and therefore were no Bishops and by consequence had no right to sitte in Parliament. 2. p. 9. Hereupon Doctor Morton pretended Bishop

shop of Durrham who is yet alive, made a speech against this booke in his owne and all the Bishops behalfe then present. He endeavoured to prove succession from the last Catholick Bishops, who (said he) by imposition of hands ordeined the first Protestant Bishops at the Nagges head in Cheap syde, as vvas notorious to all the vworld. Therefore the afore said booke ought to be looked upon as a groundless libell. This vvas told to many by one of the ancientest Peeres of England, prasant in Parliament vwhen Morton made his speech. And the same he is ready to depose upon his oath. Nay he cannot believe that any vwill be so impudent as to denie a thing so notorious, vwhereof there are as many vvitnesses living, as there are Lords and Bishops that vvvere that day in the upper house of Parliament.

Here are three passages. One concerning a booke presented to the upper house, against the successiō of English Bishops, by some presbiterian Lords.

The

The second concerning the pretended refutation of this booke by the Bishop of Duresme. The third the prooffe of both these allegations by the Testimony of an Ancient Peere of England,

First for the booke, It is most true there was a booke written about that time by a single Lord against Episcopacy, and dedicated to the members of both houses of Parliament. No wonder. How often have the Parliaments in the reignes of Queene Elisabeth and King Iames bene troubled with such *Requests and Representations*. It is no strange thing that a weak eie should be offended with the light of the sun. We may justly ascribe the reviving of the Aerian heresy in these later daies to the Dispensations of the Courte of Rome who licensed ordinary Priests to ordeine, and confirme, and do the most essentiall offices of Bishops So their Scholes do teach us, *A Preeft may be the extraordinary Minister of Priesthood, and inferiour orders by the delegation of the Pope.* Again The Pope may conferre the power of confirmation upon a simple Priest. By such exorbitant practises as these they chalked our the way to innovators. And yet they are not able to produce one president of such a dispensation throughout the primitive times, A good
Christian

Christian ought to regarde more what the whole Christian world in all ages hath practised, then what a few conceited persons in this last age have fancied. Among all the Easterne Southern and Northerne Christians, who make innumerable multitudes, there neither is nor ever was one formed Church that wanted Bishops. Yet these are as farre from submitting to the exorbitant power of the Roman Bishop as we. Among all the westernne Churches and their Colonies, there never was one formed Church for 1500. yeares, that wanted Bishops. If there be any persons so farre possessed with prejudice, that they chuse rather to follow the private dictates of their owne phrensy, then the perpetuall and universall practise of the Catholick Church, enter not into their secrets o my soule.

Thus farre we agree, but in all the rest of the circumstances, (though they be not much materiall) the Fathers do pittifully mistake themselves, and vary much from the Testimony of their witnесс, and much more from the truth. First the Authour of this booke was no presbyterian Lord, much less a company or caball of Presbyterian Lords in the plurall, but my Lord Brookes, one that had as little favour for presbytery

Presbytery as for Episcopacy.

Secondly the booke was not præsentèd to the upper house. It might be brought into the house privately, yet not be præsentèd to the house publickly. If it had bene publickly præsentèd, the Clerkes of the Parliament or some of them must needes have known of it and made an Act of it, but they know no such thing. The Lords Spirituall and Temporall could not all have Forgotten it, but they remember no such thing, as by their respective certificates præsently shall appeare.

Thirdly as the Authour is mistaken, and præsentation mistaken. So the subject likewise is mistaken. *Sit liber Index*, let the booke speake for it self. Thus an able freind certifieth me. *I have got my Lord Brookes booke which he wrote against the Bishops with much labour, and perused it with no less Patience. And there is not in it the least shadow of any Argument, that the Bishops ought not to sit in Parliament, because they had no succession or consecration. What did my Lord Brookes regard succession or Consecration or holy orders, who had a Coachman to be his preacher. The less Canonically the ordination had bene, the more he would have applauded it. Time and place and forme and all were agreeable to that Christian*

stian liberty which he dreamed of, it was not wante of consecration, but consecration it self which he excepted against, as all men knew who knew him. And in this quarrell he lost his life, after a most remarkable and almost miraculous manner, at the siege of Lichfield Church, upon St. Ceaddas anniversary day, who was the founder of that Church and Bishop of it.

I know the Fathers will be troubled much, that this which they have published to the view of the world, concerning the Bishop of Durrham, as *a truth so evident which no man can have the impudence to denie*, should be denied, yea denied positively and throughout, denied not onely by the Bishop of Durrham himself, but by all the Lords spirituall and Temporall that can be met with, Denied by some Lords of their owne communion, who understand them selves as well as any among them, though their names are not subscribed, to the certificate, Denied by the Clerkes of the Parliament, whose office it is to keepe a diary of all the speeches made in the house of the Peeres For Proofo hereof First I produce the Protestation of the Bishop of *Duresme* him self, attested by witnesses in the Presence of a publick Notary. Take it in his owne words.

Whereas

Whereas I am most injuriously and slanderously traduced, by a nameles Authour, calling himself N. N. in a booke said to be printed at Rouen 1657 intituled [a treatise of the nature of Catholick faith and heresy], as if upon the presenting of a certain booke to the upper house in the beginning of the late Parliament, proving as he saith the protestant Bishops had no succession nor consecration, and therefore were no Bishops, and by consequence ought not to sit in Parliament, I should make a speech against the said booke, in my owne and all the Bishops behalfe, endeavouring to prove succession from the last Catholick Bishops as he there stiles them,) who by imposition of hands ordeined the first protestant Bishops, at the nagges head in cheapsyde, as was notorious to all the world, &c.

I do hereby in the presence of Almighty God solemnely protest and declare to all the world, that what this Authour there affirms concerning me is a most notorious untruth and a grosse slander. For to the best of my knowledge and

and remembrance, no such booke as he there mentions was ever presented to the upper house in that or any other Parliament, that ever I sate in. And if there had, I could never have made such a speech as is there pretended, seeing I have ever spokē according to my thoughts, and alwaies believed that fable of the Nagges head consecration to have proceeded from the father of lies: as the Authentick Recordes of the Church still extant, which were so faithfully transcribed, and published by Mr. Mason, do evidently testifie. And whereas the same impudent Libeller doth moreover say, that what he there affirmes was told to many, by one of the ancientest Peeres of England, present in Parliament when I made this pretended speech: and that he is ready to depose the same upon his oath: And that he can not believe any will be so impudent, to denie a thing so notorious, whereof there are as many witnesses living, as there are Lords and Bishops that were that day in the upper house of Parliament &c. I answer, that

I am very unwilling to beleve any peere of England should have so little sense of his Conscience and honour, as either to sweare or so much as affirme such a notorious untruth. And therefore for the justification of my self and Manifestation of the truth in this Particular, I do freely and unwillingly appeale (as he directs me) to those many honourable persons, the Lord Spirituall and temporall yet alive, who sate in the house of Peeres in that Parliament, or to as many of them as this my Protestation shall come to, for a true certificate of what they know or believe Concerning this matter. Humbly desiring them and charging it upon their soules, as they will answer it to god at the day of Iudgment, that they will be pleased to testifie the truth, and nothing but the truth herein, to the best of their knowledge and remembrance, without any favour or affection to me at all. I cannot reasonably be suspected by any indifferent man, of denying any thing that I know or believe to be true, seeing I

am so shortly in all probability to render
 an account to the searcher of hearts of
 all my words and actions, being now (at
 the least) upon the ninetyfifth yeare of
 my age. And I acknowledge it a great
 mercy and favour of God, that he hath
 reserved me thus long, to cleare the
 Church of England and my self of this
 most notorious Slander, before he takes
 me to himself. For I can not imagine any
 reason, why this shamelesse writer might
 not have cast the same upon any of my
 Reverend Brethren as well as me, but
 onely that I being the eldest, it was pro-
 bable I might be in my graue, before
 this untruth could be taken notice of in
 the world. And now I thanke god I can
 therefully sing my nunc dimittis, unlesse
 it please him to reserve me for the like
 service hereafter: for I desire not to live
 any longer upon earth, then he shall
 be pleased to make me his instrument to
 defend the truth, and promote his
 glory. And for the more solemn
 and full Confirmation of this my
 free and voluntary protestation and
 B declaration

*declaration I have hereunto set my hand
and seale, this seventeenth day of Iuly.
Anno Domini 1658.*

THOMAS DVRESME.

Signed sealed published and declared, in
the presence of Tho: Sanders Sen: ,
Tho: Sanders Iun: , Iohn Barwick
Clerke, R: Gray, Evan Davies.

*I Tobias Holder publick Notary, being
requested by the Right Reverend Fa-
ther in God Thomas Lo. Bishop of Du-
resme, at the house of Thomas Sanders
Esquire, in the Parish of Flamstead, in
the County of Hartford, in the yeare of
our Lord moneth and day above speci-
fied, was then and there personally pre-
sent, where and when the said Reve-
rend Bishop did Signe publish and de-
clare this his Protestation and declara-
tion above vvritten, to be his Act and
deed, and did cause his Authentick Epi-
scopall Seale, to be there to affixed, in the
presence of the vvitneses vvwhose names
are there to subscribed. And did there
and*

and then likewise signe publish and declare as his Act and deed, another of the same Tenor written in paper, which he Signed with his Manuall Seale, in the presence of the same witnesses. All this I heard, saw, and therefore know to be done. In Testimony whereof I have subscribed and thereto put my usuall and accustomed Notaries Signe. TOBIAS HOLDER.

Publick Notary.

How doth this so solemne Protestation agree with the former Relation of the Fathers, that the Bishop of Durham affirmed publicly in the upper house that the first Protestant Bishops were Consecrated in the Nagges head, that they were not Consecrated at Lambeth, that this was notorious to all the world, that it is not Credible that any will be so impudent as to denie it, that all the rest of the Bishops approved his assertion by their silence, and were glad to have such a retiring place against the Presbyterians, that none of the Bishops did give creditt to Mr. Masons new found Registers? Even as light and Darknesse, or truth and falshood, or two Contradictory Propositions do agree together. This is the first witness whom any of that party hath adventured

tured to cite publicly and directly for that infamous story whilst he was living. And they see the successe of it. I hope they will be wiser hereafter, then to cite any more living witnesses.

But it may be that they who do not stick to suppose that our Arch-Bishops *make false certificates*, may object this is but the Testimony of the Bishop of *Durham* in his owne cause. Let us see whether the other Bishops dissent from the Bishop of *Duresme*. Take the Testimony of them all, who sate in that Parliament, which are now living except the Bishop of *Bangor*, whose absence in *Wales* is the onely reason why he is not a subscriber with the rest.

Whereas we the surviving Bishops of the Church of England, who sate in the Parliament begun at Westminster the third day of November 1640, are required by our Reverend Brother the Lord Bishop of Duresme, to declare and attest the truth, concerning an imputation cast upon him in the Pamphlet of that namelesse Author, mentioned in his Protestation and Declaration here prefixed. And whereas we are obliged to performe what he requesteth, both for the justification of the truth, and for the clearing of our selves of another slanderous aspersion, which the same Authour casteth upon us,

us, as if we had heard our said Reverend Brother make such a speech as is there pretended, and by our silence had approved, what that Libeller falsely affirmeth was delivered in it. VVe do hereby solemnly protest and declare before God and all the world, that we never knew of any such booke presented to the house of Peeres, as he there pretendeth, nor believe any such was ever presented: And therefore could never heare any such speech made against it, as he mentioneth, by our said Reverend brother or any other, much lesse approve of it by our silence. And if any such booke had bene presented, or any such speech had bene made, there is none among us so ignorant or negligent of his duty in defending the truth, but would have bene both able and ready to have confuted so groundlesse a fable, as the pretended consecration of Bishops at the Nagges head, out of the Authentick and known registers of the Church still extant, mentioned and faithfully transcribed and published by Mr. Mason so long before. For the

confirmation of which truth, and attestation of what our said Reverend Brother hath herewith Protested and declared, we have hereunto set our hands. Dated the 19th. day of Iuly Anno Domini 1658.

LONDON.	BATH. & WELLS.
M. ELI.	JO. ROFFENS.
BR. SARUM.	OXFORD.

If all these proofes seeme not satisfactory to the Fathers, they shall have more. Let them take the Testimony of the Principall Peeres now living, who sate then in Parliament.

We of the Lords temporall whose names are here under written, who sate in the Parliament begun at Westminster the third day of November 1640, being desired by the Bishop of Duresme to testify our knowledge concerning an imputation cast upon him, about a speech pretended to be made by him in that Parliament, more particularly mentiond and disavowed in his prefixed Protestation,

tion, Doe hereby testify and Declare, that to the best of our present knowledge and remembrance, no such booke against Bishops as is there mentioned, was presented to the house of Peeres in that Parliament. And consequently, that no such speech as is there pretended, was or could be made by him or any other against it. In testimony whereof we have signed this our attestation with our owne hands. Dated the nineteenth day of July Anno Domini 1658.

DORCHESTER. LINDSEY.
 RUTLAND. SOUTHAMTON.
 LINCOLNE. DEVONSHIRE.
 CLEVELAND. MONMOUTH.
 DOVER.

To this prooffe nothing remaineth that can be added, but onely the testimony of the Clerke of the Parliament, who after a diligent search made in the booke of the Lords house, hath with his owne hand written this short Certificate, in the margent of one of your bookes pag. 9. over against your relation, Upon search made in the booke of the Lords house, I do not find any such booke presented, nor any entery of any such speech made by Bishop Morton.

HENRY SCOBEL CLERK.
 Of the Parliament.

And now methinkes I heare the Fathers blaming of their owne credulity, and rashnesse, and over much confidence. They had forgotten *Epictetus* his rule, *Remember to distrust*. I judge them by my self, *Homo sum, humani a me nihil alienum puto*. One circumstance being either latent or mistaken, may change the whole drift and scope of a relation. But though we would be contented to lend a skirt of our coate, to cover the fault of them who calumniate our Church: yet this relation can never be excused in any man from a most grievous mistake, where both the person, and the whole scope of his discourse is altogether mistaken. This is almost as great a mistake as the Nagges head Ordination it self, where a confirmation dinner was mistaken for a solemne consecration. But those who cherish such mistakes for advantage, and deck them up with new matter, and publish them to the world for undoubted truths, cannot be excused from formall calumnie.

The last thing to be considered in this first part of this discourse, being the vindication of the Reverend Bishop of *Durresme*, is concerning the witnesse, whom as the Fathers do forbear to name, so shall I. Of whom they say foure things, that *he is one of the Ancientest Peeres of England*, that
he

he was present in Parliament when Morton made this speech, that he will take his Oath of the truth of it, and that he can not believe that any will be so impudent to denie it. We have no dispute concerning the antiquity of Peerage, Let that passe; but I am confidēt whatsoever his present judgement had been either of the speaker or of the speech, your witness would have abstained from uncivill language, as to stile the Reverend Bishop of Duresme a *pretended Bishop*, and plaine *Morton*, without either welt or garde. He would not have forgotten all his degrees both in the Church and in the Scholes. He will not charge all them with downe right *Impudence*, who tell him that he was doubly mistaken: Nor call that *notorious to all the world*, which he himself acknowledgeth that he never heard of before in his life. He is not guilty of those inferences, and *eo nomines* which yon have added. I do not beleevē that he doth, or ever did know the Bishop of *Duresme*, so well as to sweare this is the man: Nor doth take himself to be so exact an Analyser of a discourse, as to be able to take his Oath what was the true scope of it, *pro or contra*; especially whē some thing is started that doth quite divert his attention, as the sound of the market bell did the Philosophers Auditours,

This

This is my Charity. And my ground for it is this. When I had once conference with him about this relation, he told me the name of the Naggeshead did surprise him, and he betooke himself to inquire of another what it meant. And when I urged to him, that it was incredible that any Protestant Bishop should make such a speech, unlesse he used it onely by way of Supposition, as *argumentum ad hominem*, a reason fitte for my Lord *Brookes*, that such a Consecration as that was, agreed well enough with his principles, He told me he knew not that, the Bishop might answer so for himself.

To conclude, I have heard the Bishop of *Lincolne* did once mention the Fable of the Nagges head in a speech in Parliament, but with as much Detestation of it, as our Ancestours used to name the Devill. Why might not the mistake both of the person, and of the drift or scope of his speech, be the occasion of this relation? I had rather out of charity run into two such right handed errours, then condemne a Noble Gentleman of whose ingenuity I never had any reason to doubt, of a malicious lie. Take it at the very best, the mistake is great enough, to mistake both the person of the speaker, and the scope of his speech. I hope they will all do that which in Conscience

science they are obliged to do, that is acquitte the Bishop of *Duresme*, and crave his pardon for their mistake. If they do not, the world will acquitte him, and condemne them. But the greatest mistake of all others was, to publish such a notorious untruth to the world, so temerariouly without better advise.

CHAP. III.

*Three reasons against the Nagges head
Consecration, 1. from the Contra-
dictions of the Relaters, 2. from the
latenesse of the Discovery, 3. from
the Strictnesse of our lawes.*

NOW having beaten Downe the Pillar about their cares, which they had set up to underproppe their Nagges head Ordination, it remaineth next to assault the maine fable it self, as it is related by these Fathers. Having told, how the Protestant Doctors who were designed for Bishopricks in the beginning of Queene Elisabeths Reigne, had prevailed with Anthony Kitchen Bishop of Landaffe, to give them a meeting

at the Nagged head in Cheape syde, in hope he would Ordeine them Bishops there. And how the Bishop of Landaffe through Bishop Bonners threatenings refused, (all which shall be examined and laid open to the view of the world in due order, how it is stuffed with untruth and absurdities.) They adde, that being thus deceived of their expectation, and having no other meanes to come to their desires (that is, to obtaine consecration), they resolved to use Mr. Scories helpe, an Apostate religious Priest, who having borne the name of Bishop in King Edward the sixths time, was thought to have sufficient power to performe that Office, especially in such a strait necessity as they pretended. He, having cast of together wvith his Religious habite all scruple of conscience, wvillingly went about the matter, wvwhich he performed in this sort. Having the bible in hand, and they all kneeling before him, he laid it upon every one of their heads or shoulders, saying, take thou Authority to preach the word of God sincerely. And so they rose up
Bi;

Bishops of the new Church of England.
This narration of the consecration at
the Nagges head (they say) they have
taken out of Holynood, Constable, and
Dr. Champneys workes. They might
 as well have taken it out of Æsops
 fables, and with as much credit
 or expectation of truth on our
 partes.

So the controversy betweene them and
 us is this. They say that Arch Bishop
Parker and the rest of the Protestant Bi-
 hops, in the beginning of *Queene Elisabeths*
 reigne, or at the least sundry of them were
 consecrated at the *Nagges head* in *Cheapesyde*
 together, by Bishop *Scory* alone, or by
 him and Bishop *Barlow* jointly, without
 Sermon, without Sacrament, without any
 solemnity, in the yeare 1559. (but they
 know not what day, nor before what pu-
 blick Notaries,) by a new phantastick
 forme. And all this they say upon the
 supposed voluntary report of Mr. *Neale*
 (a single malicious spie,) in private to his
 owne party, long after the businesse pre-
 tended to be done.

We

We say Arch Bishop *Parker* was consecrated alone, at Lambeth, in the Church, by foure Bishops, authorised thereunto by Commission under the great Seale of England, with Sermon, with Sacrament, with all due solemnities, upon the 17 day of December Anno 1559. before foure of the most eniment publick Notaries in England; and particularly by the same publick Notary who was Principall Actuary both at Cardinall *Poles* Consecration and Arch Bishop *Parkers*. And that all the rest of the Bishops were Consecrated at other times, some in the same moneth but not upon the same day, some in the same yeare but not the same moneth, and some the yeare following. And to prove the truth of our relation and falshood of theirs, we produce the Register of the See of Canterbury, as authentick as the world hath any, the Registers of the other fourteene Sees then vacant, all as carefully kept by sworne Officers as the Recordes of the Vatican it self. We produce all the Commissions under the privy seale and great Seale of England: We produce the rolles or Recordes of the Chancery; And if the Recordes of the Signet office had not been unfortunately burned in King *James* his time, it might have been verified

rified by those also : We produce an Act of Parliament expresse in the pointe, within seven yeares after the Consecration: We produce all the controverted Consecrations published to the world in printe Anno 1572. three yeares before Arch Bishop *Parkers* death, whilest all things were fresh in mens memories. These bright beames had bene able to dafell the eies of *Mr. Neale* himself, whilest he was living, and have made him recant his lewd lie, or confess himself starke blinde.

The first reason which I bring against *The first* this ridiculous fable, it taken from the *reason.* palpable Contradictions, and grosse absurdities and defects of those Roman Catholick writers, who have related this silly tale of a tub, and agree in nothing but in their common malice against the Church of England. It is no strange matter for such as write upon hearesay, or relie upon the exact truth of other mens notes or memories, to mistake in some inconsiderable circumstance: as to set downe the name of a place amisse, which may be the transcribers faulte, or the printers, as well as the Authors: Or to say two Suffragans for one, when there were two named in the Commission, and but one present at the Consecration. Such immateriall differences which

which are so remote from the heart of the Cause, about indifferent Circumstances, may bring the exactness of the Relation into question, but not the substantiall truth of it. Such petty insignificant variations, do rather prove that the Relations were not made upon compact or confederacy. Especially where there are originall Records taken upon the place by sworne Notaries, whose names, and hands, and Acts are as well known to every man versed in the Records of those times, as a man knoweth his owne house. To which all Relaters and Relations must submitte, and are ready to submitte as to an infallible rule.

But he who should give credit to such a silly senslesse fable as this is, which is wholly composed of absurd, improbable, incoherent, inconsistent, contradictory fictions, had need to have a very implicate faith. The greatest shew of any accord among them is about the Consecrater, yet even in this they disagree one from another. The common opinion is that Bishop *Scory* alone did consecrate them. But Mr. Constable one of their principall authours supposeth, that Bishop *Barlow* might joine with him in the Consecration. And *Sanders*, whose penne in other cases useth to runne over, one who had as much malice

finalice as any of them, and had reason to know the passages of those times better then all of them, leaveth it doubtfull, when, or where, or by whom they were ordeined, *quomodocunque facti sunt isti Pseudo-Episcopi; by what meanes soever they were ordeined.*

But they disagree much more among themselves, who they should be that were ordeined. First *Mr. Waddesworth* (whose ingenuity deserveth to be commended) doth not say that any of our Bishops were actually consecrated there, but onely that *there was an attempt to consecrate the First of them, that was Arch-Bishop Parker.* But that which destroyeth the credit of this attempt is this, that it is evident by the Records, that Arch-Bishop *Parker* was not personally present at his Confirmation in *Bowes Church*, or at his Confirmation dinner at the *Nagges head*, which gave the occasion to this merry Legend: but was confirmed by his Proctor *Nicholas Bullingham* Doctor in the Lawes, upon the ninth of December Anno 1559. A man may be confirmed by Proxie, but no man can be

C

ordei-

ordeined by proxie. It is a ruled case in their owne law, *Non licet Sacramentum aliquod præter matrimonium absenti administrare.* So if there was an attempt to consecrate any man at the *Nagges head*, it must be Doct^r *Bullingham*, it could not be Arch Bishop *Parker*.

Others say there was more then an attempt, that one or more of them were actually ordeined there: but they name none. Others name some, but they accorde not one with another in naming of them. Some say, *Jewell, Sands, Horn, Grindall*; where was Arch Bishop *Parker*? Others say, *Parker, Grindall, Horne, Sands*. Lastly others say, they were all ordeined there, who were named to Bishopricks, and number fifteen of them. These fathers speake indefinitely, *Parker and his fellowes*. But they seeme to extend this word *fellowes* as farre as Doct^r *Champneys* fifteene: for they tell us, that they all kneeled downe before him, and he laid the Bible upon every one of their heads or shoulders. Thus these *Cadmean* brethren, like those false witnesses which testified against Christ, destroy one another with their mutuall Contradictions.

Thirdly, the time is a principall Circumstance in all Consecrations, and is evermore most punctually recorded by the Actuaries, or publick Notaries. But in this fabulous Relation the time is concealed. It seemeth the Forger was no good Actuary, and either did not know how materiall that Circumstance was, or had forgotten it. Onely Doctor *Champney* telleth us, that it was before the ninth of September Anno 1559. But this is not precise enough for an Act: and moreover, it is most apparently false and impossible. For whereas there are two Commissions under the greate Seale of *England*, for the Confirmation and Consecration of Arch Bishop *Parker*, both recorded in the *Rolles*; the one which was not executed, dated the said very ninth day of September; and the other which was executed, dated the sixth day of December following: if Doctor *Champney* said true, Arch Bishop *Parker* was consecrated before he was confirmed, yea before there was any Commission out, either for his Consecration or Confirmation; which is one of the drowsiest dreames that could droppe from an English penne.

Lastly, every Consecration must be performed before one or more publick Notaries. (We shall shew them Notaries enough of great eminence, beyond all exception, for Arch-Bishop *Parkers* true Consecration.) And indeed what could a Consecration avails any man, without a publick Notary to Recorde it, to make an authentick Certificate of it under the seale of the principall Consecrater? Now who recorded the *Nagges head* Consecration? who drew it up into Acts? Who certified it? No body, because the silly forger did not understand what things were requisite to a Consecration. Only as the *Athenians* sometimes said of *Metiochus*, *Metiochus grindes the corne*, *Metiochus bakes the bread*, *Metiochus mendes the highwaies*, *Metiochus doth all*, an evill yeare to *Metiochus*: So we may say of Mr. *Neale*; Mr. *Neale* was the spie, Mr. *Neale* was the witness, Mr. *Neale* was the publick Notary, Mr. *Neale* was the chiefe Eugenier or forger, Mr. *Neale* was all, what honours are due to Mr. *Neale*?

Qui tot sustinuit, qui tanta negotia solus.

So they feine a Consecration without a publick Notary, or (which is all one) no
man

man ever knew who that publick Notary was; At a time impossible, or els no man knoweth at what time; without any certainty who consecrated, whether *Scory* alone, or *Scory* and *Barlow* together, or God knoweth who; and yet with much lesse certainty who were consecrated, whether none at all, but onely an attempt was made, or one, and who that one was; or some indefinitely, without naming who they were, or how many they were; or foure expressly, but dissenting one from another who those foure were. Here is a story composed altogether of uncerteinties and contradictions, like *A man and no man, hit a bird and no bird, on a tree and no tree, with a stone and no stone.* To make this uncerteine, groundless, contradictory rumour, to be the touchstone of truth, and to overballance all the authentick Records of the Kingdome, in a matter of such publick concernment: is just to make the Parish clock goe truer then the Sun, because the Clerke who setteth it is our Freind.

My second reason against this senseless fable, is the late discovery of it to the world, and the long concealing of it in holes and corners before they durst adventure present it to the view of the world,

*Second
reason.*

Can any man who is in his right wittes be so stupide as to imagine, that the *Nagges head* Ordination happened in the yeare 1559, and (if these Fathers say truely) was *notoriously knowne to all the world*; and that it should never once Peepe into the light for almost a whole age after it was pretended to have been done, that is till after the yeare sixteen hundred? We use to say a monster is but nine daies wonder; but this ugly monster was not taken notice of in the world untill after forty yeares. The reason is evident; Either it was then but newly hatched, or it had bene kept all that time at dry nurse in a closet. If it had bene so *notorious to all the world* from the yeare 1559 as the fathers feine, all the windowes in the *Nagges head* would have been full of it, and the roome would have been shewed to all their guests, where such a prodigious pageant had bene acted.

I dare appeale to the judgments of these Fathers themselves, whether it be Credible, that this story should be notoriously knowne to the world in the beginning of *Queene Elisabeths* reigne, and yet neither *Stapleton*, nor *Harding*, nor *Bristow*, nor *Alan*, nor *Reynoldes*, nor *Parsons*, nor any one of all their Roman Catholick writers, should

so much as mention it for forty yeares ensuing ; especially writing so much as they did upon that very subject , the validity or invalidity of our Ordination. How could their silence have bene excused from betraying of their cause , to lose such an egregious advantage? Was it peradventure out of affection to us , to conceale the Defects of the Protestants? No, they had will enough, but they durst not avouch such a Monstrous untruth in earnest , (if ever they did heare of such a vain rumour, which I can not easily beleieve ,) so contrary to the knowledg of the t age.

Especially let them tell me how it cometh to passe , that Nicolas Sanders , who professeth to write *the Ecclesiasticall history of England, from the one and tweniethe yeare of Henry the eighth* , untill the Eight and tweniethe yeare of *Queene Elisabeth* then current , in his three bookes of the *Originall and progresse of the English Schisme*, hath not one syllable of the *Nagges head* Ordination? He was never accused of partiality for the Protestants , (but as malicious against the Protestants as any man could wish): nor of concealing truths to their advantage, but of Devising fables to their prejudice.

De
Schism.
Angl.
c. 3. p.
400.
Edit
Rom.

He having related the forme of our English Consecrations, partly true and partly false, proceedth to this first Ordination of Protestant Bishops, in the beginning of Queen *Elisabeths* Reigne; alleging that the *Catholick Bishops* refused to impose hands upon them, And that they had not of themselves two or three Bishops, or so much as one *Metropolitan*. What a shameless untruth is this, that there were not two or three Protestant Bishops, when the *Queenes* Commission under the great Seale of *England*, recorded in the Rolles, is directed to seven Protestant Bishops, expressly by their names and titles?

He addeth, that they were very instant with an *Irish Arch Bishop* to have presided at their Ordination, but he would not. He mistaketh the matter altogether, They might have had seven *Irish Arch Bishops* and Bishops if they had needed them; where the proceedings were not so rigorous, where the old Bishops complied and held their places, and joined in such Ecclesiasticall Acts, untill they had made away to their kindred, all the lands belonging to their Sees. We found one Bishoprick reduced to five

five markes a yeare by these tempo-
rifiers, another to forty shillings a yeare,
and all of them to very poore pittances
for Prelates. But by this meanes there
wanted no Ordeiners. Never did any
man question the Ordination of the first
Protestant Bishops in *Ireland* untill this
day.

Then he telleth, how being thus rejected
by the Catholick Bishops and the Irish
Arch Bishop, they applied themselves to
the lay Magistrate in the ensuing Parliament
for a confirmation, from whence they were called
Parliamentary Bishops. By whom were
they called so? By no man but himself
and his fellowes. How many Ordina-
tions were passed over, one after another,
before that Parliament? Was there any
thing moved in this Parliament, concer-
ning any the least essentiall of our Episco-
pall Ordination? Not at all, but onely
concerning the repealing and reviving
of an English Statute. English Statutes
can not change the essentialls of
Ordination, either to make that
Consecration [valid which was invalid,
or that invalid which was valid. The
validity or invalidity of Ordination, depen-
deth

deth not upon humane law , but upon the institution of Christ. Neither did we ever since that Parliament change one syllable in our forme of Ordination. Then what was this Confirmation which he speakes of ? It was onely a Declaration of the Parliament, that all the Objections which these men made against our Ordinations, were flanders and calumnies : and that all the Bishops which had been ordeined in the Queenes time, had bene rightly ordeined, according to the forme prescribed by the Church of England, and the Lawes of the Land. These men want no confidence , who are not ashamed to cite this Statute in this case. But we shall meete with this Parliament againe.

In all this impertinent Discourse , where is the fable of the *Nagges head* Ordination ? It had bene a thousand times more materiall then all this *Iargon*. And you may be sure it had not been missing , if there had bene the least graine of truth in it , or if there had but been any suspicion of it when that was written. It was not then full thirty yeares after Arch-Bishop *Parkers* Consecration , and there were store of eye-witnesses living to have hissed such a senselesse fable out of the world. And therefore
Sanders

landers very prudently for himself, after so many intimations, passeth by their Ordination in a deepe silence, which was the onely worke he tooke in hand to shew.

Qualescunque fuerint aut quomodocunque facti sint isti Psendo-Episcopi &c.

What manner of persons soever these False-Bishops were, or after what manner soever they were ordeined &c.

If Bishop Scory had ordeined them all at the Naggeshead, by layng a Bible upon their heads, and this forme of wordes, *Take thou Authority to preach the word of god Sincerely, M. Sanders* needed not to have left the case so doubtfull, how they were ordeined. And if there had bene the least suspicion of it, he would have blowen it abroad upon a silver Trumpet: but God be thanked there was none. The universall silence of all the Romish writers of that age, when the *Naggeshead* Ordination is pretended to have been done, in a case which concerned them all so nearely, and which was the Chiefe subject of all their disputes; is a convincing prooffe to all men who are not altogether possessed with prejudice, that
either

either it was devised long after, or was so lewde a lie, that no man dared to owne it, whilst thousands of eyewitneses of Arch Bishop *Parkers* true Consecration at *Lambeth* were living.

The
third
Reason.

A third reason, against this ridiculous libell of the *Nagges head* Consecration, is taken from the strictness of our lawes, which allow no man to consecrate or be consecrated but in a sacred place, with due matter and forme, and all the Rites and Ceremonies prescribed by the Church of *England*. No man must be Consecrated by fewer then foure Bishops, or three at least, And that after the Election of the Deane and Chapter is duely confirmed, And upon the mandate or Commission of the King under the great seale of *England*; under the paine of a *Premunire*, that is, the forfeiture of lands, and goods, and livings; and liberty, and protection. They allow not Consecration in a Taverne, without due matter and forme, without the Ceremonies and solemnity prescribed by the Church, without Election, without Confirmation, without letters Patents, by one single Bishop, or two at the most; such as they
feine

25. H.
8. c.
20.

feine the *Nagges head* Ordination to have
 been. Who can beleieve, that two Arch-
 Bishops and thirteen Bishoppes, ha-
 ving the reputatiou of learning and pru-
 dence, should wilfully thrust them-
 selves into an apparent Premunire, to
 forfeite not onely their Arch Bishopricks
 and Bishopricks, but all their estates and
 all their hopes, for a phantastick forme,
 and scandalous Consecration: when the
 Queene and Kingdome were favorable
 to them, when the forme prescribed by
 the Church did please them well enough,
 when there were protestant Bishops of
 their owne Communion enough to Con-
 secrate them, when all the Churches
 in the Kingdome were open to them;
 unlesse it had been Midsummer moone in
 December, and they were all starke
 mad, and then it is no matter where they
 were consecrated?

In criminall causes, where things are
 pretended to be done against penall lawes,
 such as this is, the proofes ought to be clea-
 rer then the noone day light. Here is no-
 thing proved, but one single witness named
 and he a professed enemy, who never testi-
 fied it upon Oath, or before a Iudge, or so
 much

much as a publick Notary, or to the face of a protestant, but onely whispered it in corners (as it is said by Adversaries) among some of his owne party. Such a testimony is not worth a deafe nut, in any cause betweene party and party. If he had bene a witness beyond all exception, and had bee duly sworne and legally examined, yet his testimony in the most favourable cause had been but halfe a prooffe, though an hundred did testify it from his mouth, it is still but a single testimony: And as it is, it is plaine prittle prattle, and ought to be valued no more then the shadow of an asse. To admit such a testimony, or an hundred such testimonies, against the publick authentick Records of the Kingdome, were to make our selves guilty of more madness, then they accuse the Bishops of. If *St. Paul* forbid *Timothy* to receive an accusation against a single Presbyter, under two or three witnesses, he would not have us to condemne fifteen Bishops of such a penall crime, upon a ridiculous rumour, contrary both to the lawes and Records of the Kingdome. The severity of our lawes doth destroy the credit of this fable.

The fourth and fifth reasons against this improbable fiction, from the no necessity of it, and the lesse advantage of it.

MY fourth plea is, because there was no need to play this counterfeit pageant. We use to say Necessity hath no law. that is, regardeth no law. In time of warre the lawes are silent, but this was a time of peace. First there could be no necessity why they should have a clandestine Consecration, without a Register or publick Notary, when they might have had an Army of publick Notaries ready upon their whistle, evē under their elbowes at *Bowes Church*, out of the Courtes of the *Arches*, and the *Audience*, and *Prerogative*. Secondly, there was no necessity why they should anticipate the *Queenes Letters patents* for their consecration, by whose gracious favour they were elected, and of the accomplishmēt whereof in due time they could not doubt; unlesse they would wilfully destroy their owne hopes, by such a mad pranke as this had been, that is, unlesse they would themselves

selves hew downe the bough where upon they stood. Thirdly, there was no necessity that they should chuse a common Taverne for the place of their Consecration, when the Keies of all the Churches in the Kingdome were at their Command. Fourthly, there could be no necessity why they should deserté the forme of Ordination prescribed by the Law, which was agreeable both to their judgements, and to their desires, and to their duties; and to omitte the essentialls of Ordination, both matter and forme, which they knew well enough, to be consecrated after a new brainfick manner.

Then all the necessity which can be pretended, is want of a competent number of Ordeiners. Suppose there had bene such a necessity to be ordeined by two Bishops, or by one Bishop, this very necessity had bene a sufficient Dispensation with the rigour of the Canons, and had instified the Act. as *St. Gregory* pleadeth to *Augustine*,
Resp. Int. 8. In the English Church wherein there is August. no other Bishop but thy self, thou canst not ordeine a Bishop otherwise then alone.
 And after this manner our First English Bishops were ordeined. And so might these
 these

these protestant Bishops have bene validely ordeined, if they received the essentialls of Ordination. But what a remedy is this, because they could not have a competent number of Bishops, according to the canons of the Church, and the lawes of England, therefore to reject the essentialls of Ordination, for a defect which was not essentiall, and to cast of obedience to their superiours, both civill and Ecclesiasticall? This had bene just like little children which because they can not have some toy which they desire, cast away their garments, and whatsoever their Parents had provided for them. Wante of three Bishops might in some cases make a consecration illegall or uncanonicall, but it could not have rendered it invalide, as this silly pretended Ordinatio had.

But now I come up close to the ground worke of the table, and I denie positively that there was any such want of a competent number of Bishops, as they pretend. And for prooffe hereof, I bring no vaine rumours or uncertein conjectures, but the evident and authentick testimony of the great seale of England, affixed to the *Queenes Letters Patents*, for authorising the Confirmation and Consecration of Arch-Bishop *Parker*, dated the sixth day of *December*, Anno 1559, directed

Rot. 14
Pars 2.
Elisab.

And to seven protestant Bishops, namely
Anthony Bishop of *Landaffe*, *William*
Barlow sometimes Bishop of *Bath* and *Wel-*
les, and then elect Bishop of *Chichester*,
John Scory sometimes Bishop of *Chichester*,
 then Elect Bishop of *Hereforde*, *Miles*
Coverdale sometimes Bishop of *Exceter*,
John Suffragan Bishop of *Bedford*, *John*
 Suffragan Bishop of *Theiford*, and *John*
Bale Bishop of *Ossory* in *Ireland*. Three
 are a Canonically number, if there were
 choise of seven, then there was no want
 of a competent number to ordaine cano-
 nically. I adde, that if it had bene need-
 full, they might have had seven more out
 of *Ireland*, Arch Bishops and Bishops, for
 such a worke as a consecration. *Ireland*
 never wanted store of Ordeiners. Nor
 ever yet did any man object, want of a
 Competent number of Consecraters, to an
 Irish Protestant Bishop. They who con-
 curred freely in the Consecration of Pro-
 testant Bishops at home, would not have
 denied their concurrence in England, if
 they had been commanded. Which ma-
 kes me give no credit to that vaine reporte,
 of an Irish Arch Bishop prisoner in the
 tower, who refused to complie with the
 desires of the protestant Bishops, for his li-
 berty and a large reward. But the Arch
 Bishop

Bishop wanteth a name, and the Fable wanteth a ground; the witnesses and persuaders are all unknowne. And if there had bene a graine of truth in this relation; yet in this case one man is no man, one mans refusall signifieth nothing.

Against the evident truth of this assertion, two things may be opposed out of the relation of these Fathers. The First is particular, concerning the Bishop of Landaffe, that he was no Protestant, but a Roman Catholick untill his death. So they say indeed, that *he was the onely man of all the Catholick Bishops, that tooke the oath of Supremacy.* Observe how prejudice and partiality doth blindfold men of learning and partes; They confesse he tooke the oath of supremacy, and yet esteeme him a good Roman Catholick. I see censures go by favour; and one may Steale an horse, better then another looke over the hedge. I am well contented, that they reckon him for so good a Catholick.

They adde, that *he knew Parker and the rest which were to be ordered Bishops to be hereticks, and averse from the Doctrine of the Roman Catholick Church, which he Constantly adhered unto, (the Supremacy onely excepted)*

during his life. And a little after they tell us, that *he desired to be numbred among Catholicks.* Now what if the Bishop of Landaff after all this should prove to be a protestant? Then all the Fathers story is quite spoiled. And so he was. If he knew *Parker* and the rest, to be heretickes, he knew himself to be one of their brother hereticks. His daily masse was the English Leiturgy, as well as theirs, He adhered constantly to a Protestant Bishoprick during his life, as well as any of them, And if he did not hold it as long as any of them, it was deaths fault, and none of his fault.

They say they prevailed with him to give them a meeting at the Nagges head in Cheape-side, where they hoped he would ordeine them Bishops, despairing that ever he would do it in a Church, because that would be too great and notorious a scandall for Catholicks. They were too modest. They might easily have prevailed with him, or have had him commanded to joine in their consecration in a Church, after a legall manner. He who did not stick at renouncing the Pope, and swearing an oath of Supremacy to his Prince, would not have stucke at a legall Ordination, upon the just command of his

his Prince. But to desire him to do it in a
taverne, in a clandestine manner, without
the authority of the greate seale, before
their election was confirmed, was to desire
him out of Curtesy to run into a Premu-
nire, that is to forfeit his Bishoprick of
Landaffe, his estate, his liberty. Is it
become a more notorious scandall to
Catholicks, to ordeine in a Church, then
in a taverne, in the judgment of these
fathers? There may be scandall taken at
the former, but notorious scandall is given
by the later.

Here Bishop *Bonner* steppeth upon the
stage, and had' wellneare prevented the
whole pageant, by sending his *Chaplein* to
the Bishop of Landaffe, to forbid him under
paine of excommunication to exercise any
such power of giving Orders in his diocesse, where
with the old man being terrified, and other
wise moved in conscience refused to proceed.
Bishop *Bonner* was allwaies very fierce
which way soever he went: If *Acworth* say
true, he escaped once very narrowly in *Ac-*
Rome, either burning or boiling in scalding worth
leade, for being so violent before the cont.
Assembly of Cardinalls, against the Pope, monar.
on the behalf of *Henry* the eight, if he had *Sander*.
not secured himself by flight. Afterwards l. 6. p.
he made such bonfires of protestants, 195.

and rendered himself so odious , that his prison was his onely safeguard from being torne in pieces by the People. But that was, *dum stetit Ilium & ingens Gloria Tencrorum* , whilest he had his Prince to be his second. Now he was deprived, and had no more to doe with the Bishoprick of London , then with the Bishoprick of Constantinople , he had the habituall power of the Keies , but he had no flock to exercise it upon. If he had continued Bishop of London still , what hath the Bishop of London to do with the Bishop of Landaffe? *Par in parem non habet potestatem*. Thirdly, Bowes Church which is neare the Naggeshead , wherein the Ecclesiasticall parte of this story , so farre as it hath any truth in it , was really acted , (that is the Confirmation of Arch Bishop Parkers election) though it be in the City of London , as many Churches more, is not in the Diocesse of London , but a Peculiar under the Iurisdiction of the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury.

Lastly, the Fathers say that when Parker and the rest see that he had refused , they reviled the poore old man , calling him doating foole , and some of them saying , This old foole thinketh that we can not be Bishops , unlesse we

be greased. The contrary is evident by the
 Records of the confirmation, that Arch
 Bishop Parker was not present in person;
 So this whole narration is composed of un-
 truthes, and mistakes, and incongruities,
 and contradictions. But that which disco-
 vereth the falsity of it apparently to all the
 world is this, that the Bishop of Landaff
 lived and died a protestant Bishop, in the
 reigne of Queene Elisabeth, as he had bene
 formerly in the reigne of King Edward,
 for prooffe whereof I produce two of their
 owne Authours. The one is Sanders, *But Sand,*
the Bishops, who had bene created out of the de
Church in those most wicked times, who had now Schisme,
repented from their hearts of their Schisme, l. 2. pa
being not contented with this common dispensa- 350
tion and confirmation, did each of them parti-
cularly crave pardon of their former grievous
fault from the See Apostolick, and Confirma-
tion in their Bishopricks, excepting the Bishop
of Landaffe, who omitting it rather out of ne-
gligence then malice, did onely relapse into
Schisme in the reigne of Queene Elisabeth, as
we interprete it by the just judgement of god. He Confut.
acknowledgeth, that he became a Prote- Apol.
stant againe, that is in their language, re- partie 6.
lapsed into Schisme. The other is cited by c. 2.
 Doctor Harding, *We had onely one foole*

*among us, (we see whose livery the
foole was,) who now I know not by what
entisements is become yours, being un-
worthy the name of a Lord and a Bi-
shop, whose learning is very little, and
his credit by this action much lost.*
Thus writeth Doctor *Harding* of the Bi-
shop of *Landaffe*, about the fifth yeare of
Queene Elisabeth, at which time he was li-
ving, and continued protestant Bishop of
Landaff.

A second objection against the truth of
that which hath bene said of the competent
Number of our Protestant Bishops to make
a canonick Ordination, is an exception
against all the seven Bishops named in the
letters Patents, that they were no true Bi-
shops, because all of them were ordeined
in a time of Schisme, and two of them in
King *Edwards* time, according to a new
forme of Ordination, and consequently
they could not ordeine. *That Ordina-
tion which was instituted by Edward the
sixth was judged invalide by the Catho-
licks, and so declared by publick judg-
ment in Queene Maries reigne, in so
much as leases made by King Ed-
ward*

*Brookes
Novel,
Cafes
placit.
493.*

wards Bishops , though confirmed by Deane and Chapter were not esteemed available , because they were not (saith the sentence) consecrated, nor Bishops.

To the First part of this objection, that our consecraters were ordeined themselves by Schismaticks or in a time of Schisme , I answer three waies. First this argument is a meere begging of the quæstion. The case in briebe is this. If those branches of Papall power which we cast out of *England* by our Lawes at the Reformation , were plaine usurpations , then our Reformation is but a reinfanchisement of our selves, and the Schisme lieth at their dore , then they may question the validity of their owne Ordination upon this ground, not ours: But we are ready to mainteine to all the world that all those branches of Papall power , which we cast out by our lawes at the Reformation , were grosse usurpations , First introduced into England above eleven hundred yeares after Christ. So this part of the Objection concerneth them not us.

Secondly these Fathers know wel enough, and can not but acknowledg, that according

ding to the principles of the Catholick Church and their owne practise, the Ordination not onely of Schismaticks, but of hereticks, if it have no essentiall defect is valide, and the persons so Ordeined ought not to be reordeined, but onely reconciled. Many Orthodox Christians had their holy orders from hereticall Arrians. If *Cranmer*, and *Latimer*, and *Barlow*, and *Hodgkins*, were no true Bishops, because they were ordeined in a time of Schisme; then *Gardinar*, and *Bonner*, and *Tunstall*, and *Thurleby*, &c. were no true Bishops, for they were ordeined in a time of Schisme likewise; then *Cardinall Pole*, and *Bishop Watson*, and *Christopherson*, and all rest of their Bishops were no true Bishops who were ordeined by these. So to put out one of our eies (like the envious man in the fable) they would put out both their owne.

Thirdly I answer, that it was not we who made a Discrimination betweene our Bishops and their Bishops, as to the point of Ordination, but the *Marian Bishops themselves*, who made a mutuall compact, *one and all*, that none of them should, impose hands upon any new elected Bishops; thinking vainly, there could no other

other Consecraters have bene found out ; and that by this meanes they should both preserve their Bishopricks, and bring the Queene to their bent : but they found themselves miserably deceived. Many Bishops who had bene chased out of their Bishopricks in Queene Maries daies , did now returne from exile , and supplie the place of Consecraters. Then *conjuratio* eis penituit , The Bishops repented of their Conspiracy. Multi ad iudices recurrunt, &c. many of them ran to the Iudges , confessed their obstinacy, and desired leave to take the oath of Supremacy. Thus writeth *Acworth* an Author of good account in, those daies. If this foolish conspiracy had not bene. we had had no Difference about our Consecrations.

Acworth.
cont.
Sander.
l.2. pag.
197.

To the second part of this objection, that the forme of Ordeining used in King Edwards daies, was declared invalide in Queene Maries Daies , I answer, First, that we have no reason to regarde the Iudgment of their Iudges in Queene Maries Dayes, more then they regard the judgment of our Iudges in Queene Elisabeths daies. They who made no scruple to take away their lives, would make no scruple to take away their holy Orders.

Secondly I answer that which *the Fathers* call a *sentence*, was no sentence. The word is *Dicitur*, it is said or it is reported, not *decretum est*, it is decreed. Neither were *Queene Maries* lawes proper rules, nor *Queene Maryes* Iudges at common law the proper Iudges, of the validity of an *Episcopall consecration*, or what are the *essentialls* of ordination, according to the institution of Christ. They have neither rules, nor grounds for this in the common law.

Thirdly I answer that the question in *Queene Maries* daies was not about the validity or invalidity of our Orders, but about the legality or illegality of them, not whether they were conformable to the institution of Christ, but whether they were conformable to the Lawes of England.

The Lawes of England can neither make a valide ordination to be invalide, nor an invalide ordination to be valide, because they can not change the institution of Christ. In summe *King Edwards* Bishops were both validely ordeined according to the institution of Christ, and legally ordeined according to the lawes of Englad. But *Queene Mary* changed the Law, that that forme

forme of ordeining which had bee allowed in King Edwards daies should not be allowed in her daies. Notwithstanding Queene *Maries* law, they continued still true Bishops, by the institution of Christ, But they were not for that time legall Bishops in the eie of the Law of *England*, which is the Iudges rule. But when Queene *Elisabeth* restored King *Edwards* law, then they were not onely true valide Bishops, but legall Bishops againe.

That corollary which the fathers adde, *in so much as leases made by King Edwards Bishops though confirmed by the Deane and Chapter were not esteemed available, because they were not consecrated or Bishops*, that is in the eie of the English law at that time, signifieth nothing at all. Leases concerne the benefice of a Bishop, not the Office of a Bishop. A Bishop who is legally ordeined, though he be invalidely ordeined, may make a lease which is good in law. And a Bishop which is validely ordeined, if he be illegally ordeined, may make a lease which is voide in law.

Concerning Bishop *Bonnors* Conscience, that he lost his Bishoprick for his conscience, and therefore it is not probable that *he would make himself guilty of so much*

much sacrilege; as to declare King Edwards forme of ordination to be invalide for the profit of new Leases, it belongeth not to me to judge of other mens Consciences. But for Bishop Bonners Conscience I referre him to the Testimony of one of his Freinds, *Nicolas Sanders*, who speaking of Bishop Gardiner, Bishop Bonner, Bishop Tunstall and the Bishops of Worcester and Chichester, concludeth with these words, *Timide ergo restiterunt pueri Regis primatus spiritualis, imo simpliciter subscripserunt, & in omnes ceteras innovationes, quae non videbantur ipsis continere apertam haeresim, ne Episcopatus & honores perderent, vel ultro, vel contra conscientiam coacti consenserunt.* Therefore they resisted the spirituall primacy of the King being but a boy faintly, yea they subscribed to it simply, and they consented to all the rest of the innovations, which did not seeme to them to containe manifest heresy, either of their owne accord, or compelled against Conscience, least they should lose their Bishopricks and honours. We see they had no great reason to bragge of Bishop Bonners Conscience, who sometimes had bene a great favorite of Cranmer and Crumwell. He got his Bishoprick by opposing the Pope, and lost his Bishoprick by opposing his Prince.

But

De
Schif-
mate l.
2. p. 282
Edit.
Rom.

But if reordination be such a sacrilege, many Romanists are guilty of grosse sacrilege, who reordeine those Profelites whom they seduce from us, with the same essentials, matter and forme, imposition of hands, and these words *Receive the holy Ghost;* wherewith they had been formerly ordeined by us.

Lastly I answer, (and this answer alone is sufficient to determine this controversy,) that King Edwards forme of ordination was judged valide in Queene Maries daies by all Catholicks, and particularly by Cardinall *Pole* then Apostolicall Legate in England, and by the then Pope *Paul* the fourth, and by all the clergy and Parliament of England. The case was this.

In the Act for repealing all statutes made against the see of Rome, in the first and second yeares of Philip and Mary, the Lords Spirituall and Temporall in Parliament assembled, representing the whole body of the Realme of England, presented their common request to the King and Queene, that they would be a meanes to the Legate to obtaine some settlements by authority of the Popes Holiness, for peace sake, in some Articles where of this is one.

That institutions of Benefices and other Promotions
Eccle-

*Ecclesiasticall, and Dispensations made according to the forme of the Act of Parliament might be confirmed. Institutions could not be confirmed, except Ordinations were confirmed. For the greatest part of the English Clergy had received both their benefices and their holy orders, after the casting out of the Popes usurped authority out of England. And both benefices and holy orders are comprehended under the name of Ecclesiasticall Promotions. This will appeare much more clearely by the very words of the Cardinalls Dispensation, *Ac omnes ecclesiasticas seculares seu quorumvis ordinum regulares personas, quæ aliquas impetrationes, dispensationes, concessiones, gratias & indulta, tam ordines quam beneficia Ecclesiastica, seu alias spirituales materias, pretensa auctoritate supremitatis Ecclesie Anglicanae, licet nulliter & de facto obtenuerint, & ad cor reversa Ecclesie unitati restituta fuerint, in suis Ordinibus & beneficiis, per nos ipsos seu a nobis ad id deputatos misericorditer recipiemus, prout iam multa recepta fuerunt, secumque super his opportune in domino dispensabimus; And**

And we will graciously receive (or interteine) by our selves or by others deput-
 ted by us to that purpose, (as many have
 already been received) in their Orders
 and in their Benefices, all Ecclesiasticall
 Persos as well Secular as Regular of what-
 soever Orders, which have obtained
 any suites, dispensations, grants, graces,
 and indulgences, as well in their
 Ecclesiasticall Orders, as Benefices and
 other spirituall matters, by the preten-
 ded authority of the Supremacy of the
 Church of England, though ineffectually
 and onely de facto, so they be penitent,
 and be returned to the unity of the
 Church. And we will in due season
 dispense with them in the Lord for
 these things.

Cardi-
 nall Po-
 les Dis-
 pensati-
 on.

Here we see evidently, that upon the re-
 quest of the Lotds Spirituall and Temporall
 and Commons, being the representative
 body of the Church and Kingdome of
 England, by the intercession of the King
 and Queene, the Popes Legate did receive
 all persons, which had been Ordeined or
 Beneficed, either in the time of King Henry
 or King Edward, in their respective Orders

E

and

and Benefices, which they were actually possessed of, at the time of the making of this dispensation or Confirmation, without any exception or Condition, but onely this, that they were returned to the unity of the Catholick Church. Neither was there ever any one of them who were then returned, either deprived of their Benefices, or compelled to be reordained. From whence I argue thus, Either King *Henry* the eighths Bishops and Priests, and likewise the Bishops and Priests Ordeined in King *Edward* the sixths time, had all the Essentialls of Episcopall and Priestly Ordination, which were required by the institution of Christ; and then they ought not to be reordained, Then (in the judgement of these Fathers themselves) it is grievous sacrilege to reordeine them: Or they wanted some essentiall of their respective Ordinations, which was required by the institution of Christ; and then it was not in the power of all the Popes and Legates that ever were in the world, to confirme their respective Orders, or dispense with them to execute their functions in the Church. But the Legate did Dispense with them to hold their Orders, and exercise their severall functions in the Church, and the Pope did.

did confirme that dispensation. This doth clearly destroy all the pretensions of the Romanists against the validity of our *Orders*.

It may perhaps be objected, that the dispensative word is *recipiemus*, we will receive, not we do receive. I answer, the case is all one; If it were unlawfull to receive them in the present, it was as unlawfull to receive them in the future. All that was done after, was to take a particular absolution or confirmation from the Pope or his Legate, which many of the Principall Clergy did, but not all; No not all the Bishops, Not the Bishop of *Landaff*, as *Sanders* witnesseth, Yet he enjoined his Bishoprick, So did all the rest of the Clergy, who never had any particular confirmation. It is not materiall at all, whether they were confirmed by a generall or by a speciall dispensation, so they were confirmed or dispensed with at all, to hold all their *Benefices*, and to exercise their respective Functions in the Church, which no man can deny.

Secondly it may be objected, that it is said in the Dispensation, *licet nullius & de facto obtinuerint*, Although they had obtained their *Benefices* and Promotions ineffectually and onely in fact without right: which

doth intimate that their Orders were voide and null, before they had obtained this dispensation. I answer, that he stiled them voide and null, not absolutely but respectively, *quoad exercitium*, because by the Roman law they might not be lawfully exercised without a Dispensation: but not *quoad Characterem*, as to the Character. If they had wanted any thing necessary to the imprinting of the Character, or any thing essentiall by the institution of Christ, the Popes Dispensation and Confirmation had been but like a seale put to a blanke piece of paper. And so the Cardinalls dispensation in generall, and particularly for Benefices and Ecclesiasticall Promotions, Dispensations, and Graces given by such Order as the lawes of the Realme allowed and prescribed, in King *Henries* time and King *Edwards* time, was then and there ratified by act of Parliament.

Lastly, that this Dispensation was afterwards confirmed by the Pope, I prove by the confession of *Sanders* himself, though a malicious enemy. *He* (that is *Cardinall Pole*, in a publick Instrument set forth in the name and by the authority of the Pope) *Confirmed all Bishops*
which

Which had bene made in the former Schisme, so they were Catholick in their judgment of Religion, and the six new Bishopricks which King Henry had erected in the time of the Schisme.

De
Schism.
l. 2.
p. 350.

And this writing being affixed to the Statute, was published with the rest of the Decrees of that Parliament, and their minds were pacified. All which things were established and confirmed afterwards, by the Letters of Pope Paul the fourth.

We have seene, that there were a competent number of Protestant Bishops beyond Exception to make a Consecration: And so the necessity, which is their onely Basis or Foundation of the *Nagges head* Consecration, being quite taken away, this prodigious fable having nothing els to support the incredibilities and inconsistencies of it, doth melt away of it self like winter ice.

The fifth reason is drawn from that well known principle in Rethorick, *Cui bono?* or what advantage could such a consecration, as the *Nagges head* Consecration is pretended to have been, bring to the

A fifth
reason

Consecraters or the persons consecrated, God and Nature never made any thing in vaine. The haire of the head, the nailes upon the fingers ends, do serve both for ornament and muniment. The leaues defend the blossomes, the blossomes produce the fruite, which is Natures end. In sensibles, the Spider doth not weave her webbes, nor the silly Bee make her celles in vaine. But especially intellectuall creatures have alwaies some end of their Actions. Now consider, what good such a mock Consecratiō could doe the persons so consecrated? Could it helpe them to the possession of their Bishopricks by the law of England? Nothing lesse. There is such a concatenation of our English Customes and Recordes, that the counterfeiting of of any one can do no good, except they could counterfeite them all, which is impossible.

When any Bishops See becommeth voide, there issueth a Writ out of the Exchequer to seise the Temporalties into the Kings hand, as being the ancient and well knowne Patron of the English Church; leaving the Spiritualties to the Arch Bishop or to the Deane and Chapter, according to the custome of the place. Next the King
gran-

granteth his *Conge d'Eslire* or his License to chuse a Bishop, to the Deane and Chapter; upon the receite of this License, the Deane and Chapter, within a certain number of daies, chuse a Bishop, and certifie their Election to the King, under the common seale of the Chapter.

Upon the returne of this Certificate, the King granteth out a Commission under the great seale of England to the Arch Bishop, or in the vacancy of the Arch Bishoprick to so many Bishops, to examine the Election: and if they find it fairly made to confirme it, and after Confirmation to proceed to the Consecration of the person elected, according to the forme prescribed by the Church of England. This Commission or Mandate must passe both through the Signet office and Chancery, and be attested by the Clerkes of both those offices, and signed by the Lord Chancellor and Lord privy seale, and be inrolled. So as it is morally impossible there should be any forgery in it.

Vpon the receite of this Mandate, the Bishops who are authorised by the King, do meete first at *Bowes Church* in *London*, where with the assistance of the Chiefe Ecclesiasticall Judges of the Realm, the

Deane of the Arches, the Iudges of the Prerogative and Audience, with their Registers to Actuate what is done, they do solemnly in forme of law confirme the election. Which being done, and it being late before it be done, the Commissioners and Iudges were and are sometimes invited to the *Nagges head* to a dinner, as being very neare *Bowes Church*, and in those daies the onely place of note, This meeting led Mr. *Neale* (a man altogether-unacquainted with such formes,) into this fooles Paradise; first to suspect, and upon suspicion to conclude, that they were about an Ordination there, and lastly to broach his brainfick conceites in corners; and finding them to be greedily swallowed by such as wished them true, to assert his owne drowfy suspicion for a reall truth. But the mischief is, that Doctor *Parker* who was to be consecrated, was not present in person, but by his Proxie.

After the Confirmation is done, commonly about three or foure daies, (but as it happened in Arch Bishop *Parkers* case nine daies,) the Commissioners proceed to the Consecration; for the most part out of their respect to the Archbishop in the Chappell at *Lambeih*, with Sermon, Sacrament, and all solemnity requisite, according to the forme
pre-

prescribed by the Church of *England*; in the presence of publick Notaries or sworne Officers, who reduce every thing that is done with all the circumstances into Acts, and enter them into the Register of the See of *Canterbury*. Where they are carefully kept by the principall Officer in a publicke office, as Recordes, where every one who desireth may view them from time to time, and have a copy of them if he please. And it is to be noted, that at any Consecration, especially of an Arch-Bishop, great numbers of principall Courtiers and Citisens are present: so as it is no more possible to counterfeite such a Consecration, then to walke invisible upon the Exchange at noone day.

After the Consecration is done, the person Consecrated is not presently admitted to his Bishoprick, First the Arch Bishop maketh his certificate of the Consecration with all the circumstances of it, under his Arch-Episcopall seale: Thereupon the King taketh the new Bishops oath of fealty, and commands that he be put into the Actual possession of his Bishoprick: Then he is enthroned, and at his Inthronisation his Ordination is publicly read: Then he injoiethe his Spiritualties: Then issueth a Writ out of the Exchequer to the Sherif, to restore him to the Temporalties of his Bishoprick.

This

This custome is so ancient, so cerrein, so generall, that no Englishman can speake against it.

Here we see evidently how al things do pursue one another, and what a necessary and essentiall connexion there is betweene them. So as the stealing of an Election, or the stealing of a Consecration, can get no man a Bishoprick, as Mr. Neale dreamed. He that would advantage himself that way, must falsifie all the Records both Ecclesiasticall and Civill. He must falsifie the Records of the Chancery, of the Signet office, of the Exchequer, of the Registries, of the Bishop, of the Deane and Chapter. He must counterfeite the hands and seales of the King, of the Arche-Bishop, of the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Privy seale, of the Clerkes and publick Notaries, which is not imaginable. If Mr. Neale, who first devised this drowsy dreame (or somebody for him) had had more experience of our English lawes and Customes, he would have feined a more probable tale, or have held his peace for ever.

Answer me, They who are calumniated to have had their Consecration at the *Nagges head*, did they meane to conceale it and have

have it kept secret? Then what good could it do them? *De non existentibus & non apparentibus eadem est ratio*: If it were concealed, it was all one as if it had never bene. Or did they meane to have it published? Such an Ordination had bene so farre from helping them to obtaine a Bishoprick, that it had rendred them uncapable of a Bishoprick for ever: And moreover subjected both the Consecraters and the Consecrated to deprivation, and degradation, and a Premunire or forfeiture of their lands goods and liberties, and all that were present at it to excommunication, *Rome* is a fitte place wherein to publish such Ludibrious fables as this; where they can persuade the people, that the Protestants are stupid creatures, who have lost their Religion, their reason, and scarcely reteine their humaine shapes. It is too bold an attempt, to obtrude such counterfeit wares in *England*.

The sixth and seventh reasons, that all the Records of England are diametrically opposite to their Relation, and do establish our Relation.

Hitherto we have beene taking in the out workes: Now I come directly to assault this Castle in the aire, That which hath bene said already is sufficient to perswade any man, who is not brimmed full of prejudice and partiality: The other five reasons which follow next, have power to compell all men, and command their assents.

My sixth reason is taken from the diametricall oppositiō which is betweene this fabulous relation of the *Nagges head* Ordination, and all the Recordes of *England*, both Ecclesiasticall and civill. First for the time. The Romanists say, that this Ordination was before the ninth of *September* Ann. 2559: but it is apparent by all the Recordes of the Chancery, all the distinct Letters Patents or Commissions for their Respective Confirmations, and Consecrations, whereupon they were consecrated, did issue out long after; namely, Arch Bishop *Parkers* Letters Patents (which were the first) upon the sixth day of *December* following. Next the
Com-

Commissions for Grindall, Cox and Sands;
Then for Bullingham, Jewel, and Davis.

Then for Benham and Barkley; and
in the yeare following for Horn, Al-
ley, Scambler, and Pilkinton. He that hath
a mind to see the Copies of these Commis-
sions, may find them Recorded *Verbatim*

both in the Rolles of the Arch Bishops Re-
gister, and in the Rolles of the Chancery. *Rot. pars 14. 2. El.*

To what end were all these Letters Patents,
to authorise so many Confirmatiōs and Con-
secrations, if the Consecrations were done
and past long before? No mans Election
can be confirmed in *England*, but by virtue
of the Kings Letters Patents. Therefore
the Letters Patents must precede the Confir-
mation and Consecration, not follow after
it three moneths, or foure moneths, or six
moneths, and in some of the above a yeare.

And as by the Recordes of the Chancery,
so their relation is proved to be a notorious
fable, by all the Ecclesiasticall Recordes;
first of their severall and distinct Confirma-
tions, which pursued their Commissions
punctually; Then of their severall and di-
stinct Consecrations which pursued their
Confirmations punctually. He who desireth
to see these, may finde Authentick Recordes
of them all, both Confirmations and Con-
secrations

tions, in the Register of the Arch Bishop of *Canterbury*. It is not the forging of one Recorde that would serve the turne: Either all these Recordes must be forged, or the *Nagges head* Ordination is a silly senselesse fable.

Lastly after the Consecration followeth the Installement or Inthronisation, which is to be found in the Register of the Deane and Chapter: And the Restitution of the new Bishop to his Temporalties by virtue of the Kings Writ, mentioning the Confirmation and oath of fealty to the King, as being temporall things. Observe how every one of these do pursue another. Arch Bishop *Parkers* Commission issued *December* the sixth, his Confirmation followed *December* the ninth, his Consecration *December* the seventeenth, his Inthronisation forthwith, and the Restitution to his temporalties the first of *March* ensuing, that is, at the later end of the very next terme: But by their Relation, the Consecration was long before the Election was confirmed, which can not be; The Letter Patents to license the Confirmation and Consecration, come out three moneths after the Consecration was done, which is incredible. As for the Confirmation, Mr.

Neale

Neale who was their contriver, knew not what it was. The installement followed three moneths after the Consecration, and the Restitution to the Temporalities six moneths after; which have no probability.

Thus for the time, next for the place. Their lying Relation saith, the elected Bishops were consecrated at the *Nagges head*: All the Ecclesiasticall Records say they were consecrated at *Lambeth*. The Kings Commission injoineth a legall Consecration according to the forme prescribed by law: Such a legall Consecration ours at *Lambeth* was; Such a legall Consecration theirs at the *Nagges head* was not, neither for the place, nor for the rites, nor for the essentials of Consecration. And without good assurance that the Consecration was legall, neither the person consecrated could have bene introned, nor made his oath of fidelity to the King, nor have bene restored to his Temporalities: but he was introned, and did his fealty, and was restored to his temporalities, that is as much as to say, that his Consecration was legally performed at *Lambeth*, not illegally at the *Nagges head*.

Thirdly for the Consecrater. That fabulous Relation seimeth that there was but one

one Consecrater, or at the most two: the authentick Records of the Church of *England* testifie, that there were foure Consecraters. The Letters Patents require that there should be four Consecraters, and without an authentick Certificate that there were four Consecraters, the Kings Writ for restitution had not issued.

They feine that they imposed hands mutually, *Scory* upon them and they upon *Scorie*: But the Records witnesse that *Scory* was solemnely ordeined Bishop in King *Edwards* time, the thirteenth day of *August* Anno. 1551, by the Arch Bishop of *Canterbury*, the Bishop of *London* and the Suffragan Bishop of *Bedford*; and needed not to be reordeined at the *Nagges head*.

Reg.
Cran.
fol.
334.

Lastly, for the persons consecrated, some of them feine that all the elected Bishops, and all of them say that many of them, were consecrated together at one time with Arch Bishop *Parker*: But all the Records both Civill and Ecclesiasticall do testifie the contrary, that they had severall Commisions, severall Confirmations, severall Consecrations, upon severall daies, in severall moneths, in severall yeares, severall Consecraters; as appeareth most evidently not onely by the Authentick Records of the See of *Canterbury*, but also by the Records

of

of the Chancery, And particularly by the severall Commissions directed expressly to ArchBishop *Parker*, as a Bishop actually consecrated, for the Consecration of all the rest, the three first of which Commissions or Letters Patents beare date the eighteenth of *December* An: 1559, that is the very next day after ArchBishop *Parkers* Consecration; for the Confirmation and Consecration of *Grindall*, *Coxe*, and *Sands*, three of those elected Bishops. He that doubteth of the truth of these Letters Patents, may find them recorded *verbatim*, both in the Arch-Bishops Registry, and in the Rolles. If they were confirmed and consecrated by Arch-Bishop *Parker*, then they were not consecrated together with Arch-Bishop *Parker*, as in that lyng relation is affirmed. And with this their subsequent Installments and Restitutions do exactly agree. Either all the Recordes of *England* must be false, or this silly fable of the *Nagges head* is a prodigious forgery.

Thus we have scene how the Recordes of *England*, civill and Ecclesiasticall, do contradict this tale of a tub. My seventh reason sheweth how the same Recordes do confirme and Establish our relation. We

*The seventh
venib
Reason.*

say first (that the See of *Canterbury* being
voide by the death of *Cardinall Pole*, (who
The se- died as some say the very same day with
venth. *Queene Mary*, others say the day follo-
reason. wing,) the *Queene* granted her *conge d'eslire*
to the *Deane* and *Chapiter* of *Canterbury* to
chuse an *Arch-Bishop*. This is clearly
proved by the authentick Copy of the *conge*
d'eslire itself in the *Rolles*. *Regina dilectis*
Rot. sibi in Christo *Detano & Capitulo Ecclesia Me-*
pa. 6. *tropolitica Cantuariensis salutem &c.*
I. Elis.

Examinatur

RICHARD BROUGHTON.

Secondly we say, that the *Deane* and *cha-*
piter having received this license, did
chuse *Doctor Maibew Parker* for their
Arch-Bishop. This is apparent by the
Queenes Commission for his *Confirmation*
and *Restitution*, wherein there is this clause:
And the said Deane and Chapiter, by virtue
of our license, have chosen our beloved in Christ
Maibew Parker *Professor of Theology*, for
Arch-Bishop and *Pastour* to them and the
aforesaid *Church*, as by their letters *Patents*
directed to us thereupon it appeareth more
fully.

Thirdly

Thirdly the Queene accepting this Election, was graciously pleased to issue out two Commissions for the legall Confirmation of the said Election, and consecrating of the said Arch-Bishop. The former dated the ninth of September Anno 1559, Directed to six Bishops, Cuthbert Bishop of Durham, Gilbert Bishop of Bath, David Bishop of Peterborough, Anthony Bishop of Landaff, William Barlow Bishop, and John Scory Bishop, in these words.

*Elisabeth dei gratia Anglia &c.
Reverendis in Christo Patribus Cuthberto Episcopo Dunelmensi, Gilberto Bathoniensi Episcopo, Davidi Episcopo Burgi Sancti Petri, Anthonio Landavensi Episcopo, VVillelmo Barlo Episcopo, & Iohanni Scory Episcopo, Salutem. Cum vacante nuper Sede Archiepiscopali Cantuariensi per mortem naturalem Domini Reginaldi Pole Cardinalis, ultimi & immediati Archiepiscopi & Pastoris ejusdem, ad humilem petitionem Decani & Capituli Ecclesie nostre Cathedralis & Metropolitana Christi Cantuariensis, eisdem per literas nostras patentes licentiam concesserimus*

Ro:
pars 2.
1. Elis.

alium sibi eligendi in Archiepiscopum
 & Pastorem Sedis predictæ. Ac iidem
 Decanus & Capitulum vigore & obten-
 tu licentiæ nostræ predictæ, dilectum no-
 bis in Christo Magistrum Matthæum
 Parker Sacræ Theologiæ Professore sibi
 & Ecclesiæ predictæ elegerint in Ar-
 chiepiscopum & Pastorem, prout per li-
 teras suas patentes Sigillo eorum com-
 muni sigillatas, nobis inde directas, ple-
 nius liquet & apparet. Nos electionem
 illam acceptantes, eidem electioni Regi-
 um nostrum assensum adhibuimus pari-
 ter & favorem, & hoc vobis tenore
 presentium significamus. Rogantes, ac
 in fide & dilectione quibus nobis tene-
 mini firmiter precipiendo mandantes;
 quatenus eundem Magistrum Matthæum
 Parker in Archiepiscopum & Pastorem
 Ecclesiæ Cathedralis & Metropolitana,
 Christi Cantuariensis predictæ, sic ut
 præfertur electum, electionemque præ-
 dictam confirmare, & eundem Magi-
 strum Matthæum in Archiepiscopum
 & Pastorem Ecclesiæ predictæ consecra-
 re, ceteraque omnia & singula peragere,
 quæ

qua vestro in hac parte incumbant officio Pastoralis, juxta formam Statutorum in ea parte editorum & provisorum, velitis cum effectu. In cujus rei testimonium &c. Teste Regina apud Redgrave, nono die Septembris Anno Regni Elisabethæ Angliæ &c. primo.

Per breve de privato Sigillo.

Examinatur R I: BROUGHTON.

Now if any man desire a reason why this first Commission was not executed, the best account I can give him is this, That it was directed to six Bishops, without an[*aut minus, or at the least foure of you*]: so as if any one of the six were sick or absent, or refused, the rest could not proceed to Confirm, or Consecrate. And that some of them did refuse, I am very apt to believe, because three of them not long after were deprived. But the Reader may note, First that there were three Protestant Bishops in that First Commission. They who were such punctuall observers of the law of England, that they would not proceed to consecrate without a fourth, in the vacancy.

cancy of both the Archiepiscopall Sees , certainly would never give way to a private profane Ordination at the *Nagges head*, by one single Bishop. And secondly, that for all their pretended intelligence, our English Romish writers are great strangers to the true passages of those times, knowing nothing but what they heare at *Rome*, or *Rhemes*, or *Doway*. If it were otherwise we should have heard of this Commission sooner.

The second Letters Patents which were executed, were dated the sixth of *December* following, directed to *Anthony* Bishop of *Landaff*, *William Barlow* sometimes Bishop of *Bath*, now Elect Bishop of *Chicester*, *Iohn Scory* sometimes Bishop of *Chichester*, now Elect Bishop of *Hereford*, *Miles Coverdale* sometimes Bishop of *Exceter*, *Richard* Suffragan Bishop of *Bedford*, *Iohn* Suffragan Bishop of *Therford*, and *Iohn Bale* Bishop of *Ossory* in *Ireland*, in these words,

*Regina &c. Reverendis in Christo
Patribus Antonio Landavensi Epif-
copo, Wilhelmo Barlow quondam Ba-
thoniensi Episcopo, nunc Cicestrensi Ele-
cto*

*cto, Iohanni Scory quondam Cicestrensi
 Episcopo, nunc Electo Herefordiensi,
 Miloni Coverdale quondam Exoniensi
 Episcopo, Richardo Bedfordensi, Iohanni
 Thedfordensi, Episcopis Suffraganeis,
 Iohanni Bale Ossoriensi Episcopo, Salu-
 tem. Cum vacante nuper Sede Ar-
 chiepiscopali Cantuariensi per mortem
 naturalem Domini Reginaldi Pole Car-
 dinalis, ultimi & immediati Archiepi-
 scopi & Pastoris ejusdem, ad humilem
 petitionem Decani & Capituli Ecclesie
 nostre Cathedralis & Metropolitanae
 Christi Cantuariensis, eisdem per Lite-
 ras nostras Patentes licentiam conceße-
 rimus alium sibi Eligendi in Archiepi-
 scopum & Pastorem Sedis predictae,
 Ac iidem Decanus & Capitulum vi-
 gore & obtentu Licentiae nostrae predictae,
 dilectum nobis in Christo Magistrum
 Matthaeum Parker Sacrae Theologiae
 Professorem, sibi & Ecclesiae predictae Ele-
 gerunt in Archi-Episcopum & Pastorem,
 prout per Literas suas patentes nobis inde
 directas plenius liquet & apparet. Nos*

electionem illam acceptantes, eidem electioni Regium nostrum assensum adhibuimus pariter & favorem, & hoc vobis tenore presentium significamus. Rogantes ac in fide & dilectione quibus Nobis tenemini firmiter precipiendo mandantes, quatenus vos aut minus quatuor vestrum, eundem Matthaeum Parker in Archi-Episcopum & Pastorem Ecclesiae Cathedralis & Metropolitanae Christi Cantuariensis praedictae sicut praefertur Electum, electionemq; praedictam Confirmare, & eundem Magistrum Matthaeum Parker in Archi-Episcopum & Pastorem Ecclesiae praedictae consecrare, Ceteraque omnia & singula peragere, quae vestro in hac parte incumbant officio Pastoralis, juxta formam statutorum in ea parte editorum & provisorum, velitis cum effectu. Supplentes nihilominus suprema Authoritate nostra Regia, ex mero motu & certa Scientia nostris, si quid aut in his quae juxta mandatum nostrum praedictum per vos fient, aut in vobis, aut vestrum aliquo, conditione, Statu, facultate vestris, ad pra-

premissa perficienda desit aut deerit eorum, quæ per statuta hujus Regni nostri aut per leges Ecclesiasticas in hac parte requiruntur, aut necessaria sunt, temporis ratione & rerum necessitate id postulante. In cujus Rei &c. Teste Regina apud Westmonasteriū sexto die Decembris, Anno Regni Regina Elisabeth Anglia &c. Secundo.

Examinatur.

R I: BROUGHTON.

Before I proceed further, to prevent cavills, I must acquainte the Reader, that the Suffragan Bishop of Bedford is misnamed *Richard* in the Rolles; by what mistake or errour, after so long time it is folly to inquire. We may Conjecture how it might easily, and most probably did come to passe: but to say positively how it did come to passe, whether it was the errour of the transcriber, or the mistake of him who gave the instructions, or it was no fault at all, (he might have two names, as many have had, and, many have

have and owne them severally,) is not possible. In the Ecclesiasticall Register of the Church, he is alwaies stiled by his right name *John*, throughout all the Acts of the Confirmation and Consecration of Arch Bishop *Parker*. Once his name had been written *Richard*, but it was corrected, and my friend assureth me, that it is the onely word in that long narration which is expunged or interlined; So exact is that Recorde. This is certeine, his right name was *John*, as it is in the Register. To this the Recordes of his own Consecration, and twenty other Recordes do beare witness.

But as to the validity of the Act or Ordination, it is not materiall whether his name were *John* or *Richard*, or both, or neither. So he was truly ordeined himself, and did truly concurre in ordeining, it is no matter how he is Stiled in the Commission, or in the Register. Regall Commissions are no essentialls of Ordination. Notariall Acts are no essentialls of Ordination. The misnaming of the Baptiser in a Parish Register doth not make voide the Baptisme. When Popes do consecrate themselves, (as they do sometimes), they do it by the names of *Paul*, or *Alexander* or
Vrbannus

Urbanus, or *Innocentius*: yet these are not the names which were imposed upon them at their Baptismes, or at their Confirmations, but such names as themselves have been pleased to assume. But to come to more serious matter.

There are two differences between these two Commissions. The first is an [*aut minus, Or at the least foure of you*], which clause is prudently inserted into all Commissions, where many Commissioners are named. least the sicknesse, or absence, or neglect of any one or more, might hinder the worke. The question is, why they are limited to foure, when the Canons of the Catholick Church require but three. The answer is obvious, because the Statutes of *England* do require foure in case one of the Consecraters be not an Arch Bishop, or deputed by one. Three had bene enough to make a valide Ordination, yea to make a Canonick Ordination; and the Queene might have dispensed with her owne lawes: but she would have the Arch Bishop to be ordeined both according to the canons of the Catholick Church, and the known lawes of England.

The second difference between the two Commissions is this, that there is a *Sup-
plemes*

pluries in the later Commission, which is not in the former. [*Supplyng by our Sovereigne authority all defects either in the Execution, or in the Executors of this Commission, or any of them*]. The Court of Rome in such like instruments have ordinarily such dispensative clauses, for more abundant caution, whether there be need of them or not, to *relaxe all sentences censures, and penalties inflicted either by the law or by the Iudge.*

But still the question is, to what end was this clause inserted? I answer, it is end enough, if it serve (as the Court of Rome useth it,) for a certeine salve to helpe any latent impediment, though there be none. A superfluous clause doth not vitiate a writing. Some thinke it might have reference to Bishop Coverdales *syde woollen gowne*, which he used at the Consecration *roga lanea talari utebatur*. That was uncanonicall indeed, and needed a dispensation for him that used it, not for him who was consecrated. But this was so slender a defect and so farre from the heart or essence of Ordinatiō; especially where the three other Cōsecraters, (which is the canonicall number) were formally and regularly habited, that it was not worth an intimation under the

the

the great seale of *England*. This *Miles Corverdale* had been both validely and legally ordeined Bishop, and had as much power to ordeine as the Bishop of *Rome* himself. If he had been Roman Catholick in his judgment, he had been declared by Cardinall *Pole* as good a Bishop, as either *Bonner*, or *Thirleby*, or any of the rest.

Others thinke, this clause might have relation to the present condition of Bishop *Barlow* and Bishop *Scory*, who were not yet inthroned into their new Bishopricks. It might be so, but if it was, it was a great mistake in the Lawiers who drew up the Commission. The Office and the Benefice of a Bishop are two distinct things; Ordination is an act of the Key of Order, and a Bishop uninthroned may ordeine as well as a Bishop inthroned. The Ordination of Suffragan Bishops, who had no peculiar Bishopricks, was alwaies admitted and reputed as good in the Catholick Church, (if the Suffragans had Episcopall Ordination,) as the Ordination of the greatest Bishops in the world.

But since this clause doth extend ir self both to the Consecration and the Consecraters, I am confident that the onely ground

ground of it was that same exception, or rather cavill which Bishop Bonner did afterwards make against the legality of Bishop Hornes Consecration; which is all that either Stapleton or any of our Adversaries had to pretend against the legality of the Ordination of our first Protestant Bishops; that *they were not ordeined according to the praescript of our very Statutes.*

I have set downe this case formerly in my replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon: But to avoide wrangling, I will put it downe in the very wordes of the Statute. *King Edward the Sixth in his time by authority of Parliament, caused the booke of Common Praier and Administration of Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies in the Church of England, to be made and set forth, not onely for one uniforme Order of Service, Commō Prayer, and Administration of Sacraments to be used whithin this Realme, but also did adde and put to the said booke, a very godly Order manner and forme, how Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons and Ministers, should from time to*

to time be consecrated, made, and ordered, within this Realme. Afterwards it followeth, that in the time of Queene Mary, the severall Acts and statutes made in the second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth yeares of King Edward, for the authorising and allowing of the said booke of Common praier and other the premisses, were repealed. Lastly the Statute addeth, that by an Act made in the first yeare of Queene Elisabeth, entituled *An act for the uniformity of Common prayer and service in the Church, and administration of Sacraments*, the said booke of Common Praier and Administration of Sacraments, and other the said Orders Rites and Ceremonies before mentioned, and all things therein contained, is fully stablished and authorised to be used in all places within the Realme.

This is the very case related by the Parliament. Now the exception of Bishop Bonner, and Stapleton, and the rest, was this. The booke of Ordination was expressly established by name by Edward the Sixth,
And

And that Act was expressely repealed by Queene Mary: But *the booke of Ordination* was not expressely restored by Queene *Elisabeth*, but onely in generall termes under the name and notion of the Booke of Common Praiers and administration of Sacraments, and other orders rites and Ceremonies. Therefore they who were ordeined according to the said forme of Ordination in the beginning of Queene *Elisabeths* time, were not legally ordeined. And those Bishops which had bene ordeined according to that forme in King *Edwards* time, though they were legally ordeined then, yet they were not legal Bishops now, because Queen *Maries* statute was still in force, and was not yet repealed.

Is this all? Take courage Reader, Here is nothing that toucheth the validity of our Ordination, but onely the legality of it, which is easily satisfied. First I answer that Queene *Maries* Statute was repealed sufficiently, even as to the booke of Ordination; as appeareth by the very words of the Statute which repealed it, *And that the said booke, with the order of Service and of the administration of Sacraments rites and Ceremonies, shall be after the feast of St. Iohn Baptist next in full force and effect, any thing in*
 Queene

Queene Maries Statute of repeale to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding. That the booke of Ordination was a part of this booke, and printed in this booke in King Edwards daies, besides the expresse testimony of the Statute in the eighth of Queene Elisabeth we have the authority of the Canons of the Church of England, which call it singularly *the booke of Common Praier, and of Ordering Bishops Priests and Deacons.* It is our forme of praier upon that occasion, as much as our forme of baptising, or administering the holy Eucharist, or our forme of confirming, or marryng, or visiting the sick. Can. 36

Secondly, it is also a part of our forme of Administration of the Sacraments. We denie not Ordination to be a Sacrament, though it be not one of those two Sacraments, which are generally necessary to salvation.

Thirdly, although it were supposed that Ordination were no Sacrament, nor the booke of Ordination a part of the booke of Common praier: yet no man can denie that it is a part of our Ecclesiasticall rites and ceremonies, and under that notion sufficiently authorized.

Lastly,

Ejus est legem interpretari cujus est condere.

G

They

8. *Elc.*
cap. I,

They who have legislative power to make a law, have legislative power to expound a law. *Queene Elisabeth* and her Parliament made the law, *Queene Elisabeth* and her Parliament expounded the law, by the same authority that made it; declaring that under the booke of *Common Praier*, the forme of Ordination was comprehended and ought to be understood. And so ended the grand cavill of Bishop *Bonner* and Doctor *Sapleton* and the rest, of the illegality of our Ordination; shewing nothing but this, how apt a drowning cause is to catch hold of every reed,

That the *Supplentes* or this dispensative clause had Relation to this cavill, (which as it did breake out afterwards into an open controversy, so it was then whispered in corners,) is very evident by one clause in the Statute: that for the avoiding of all questions and ambiguities that might be objected against the lawfull Confirmations, investing, and Consecrations of any Arch-Bishops, Bishops &c. the *Queene* in her Letters Patents had not onely used such words as had bene accustomed to be used by King Henry and King Edward, but also diverse other generall wordes, whereby her Highness by her Supreme power and authority, hath dispensed with all causes and doubts of
any

any imperfection or disability that could be objected. The end of this clause and that Statute was the same: And this was the onely question or ambiguity which was moved.

Yet although the case was so evident, and was so judged by the Parliament, that the forme of Consecration was comprehended under the name and notion of the booke of Common praier &c: yet in the indictment against Bishop *Bonner*, I do commend the discretion of our Iudges, and much more the moderation of the Parliament. Criminall lawes should be written with a beame of the sun, without all ambiguity.

Lastly, before I leave this third consideration, I desire the Reader to observe three things with me. First, that this dispensative neither hath, nor can be construed to have any reference to any Consecration that was already past, or that was acted by Bishop *Scory* alone; as that silly Consecration at the *Nagges head* is supposed to have been.

Secondly, that this dispensative clause doth not extend at all to the institution of Christ, or any essentiall of Ordination, nor to the Canons of the universall Church: but

onely to the Statutes and Ecclesiasticall lawes of England. *Si quid desit aut deest eorumque per Statuta hujus Regni nostri, aut per leges Ecclesiasticas requiruntur.*

Thirdly, that the Commissioners authorised by these Letters Patents to confirm and consecrate ArchBishop Parker, did make use of this *Supplentes* or dispensative power in the Confirmation of the Election, which is a politicall Act, (as by the words of the Confirmation in the next paragraph shall appeare,) but not in the Consecration, which is a purely spirituall act, and belongeth meerely to the Key of Order.

Fourthly we say, that by virtue of these Letters Patents of December the sixth, foure of the Commissioners therein named did meete in Bowes Church, upon the ninth day of the same moneth: and then and there with the advise of the chiefe Ecclesiasticall Lawiers of the Kingdome, the Deane of the Arches, the Iudges of the Prerogative and Audience, did solemnely confirme the election. This is proved by the Recorde of the Confirmation or definitive sentence it self, in these words.

In

In Dei nomine, Amen. Nos Wil-
helmus quondam Bathoniensis & Vvel-
lensis Episcopus nunc Cicestreusis Elec-
tus, Iohannes Scory quondam Cicestren-
sis Episcopus nunc Electus Hereforden-
sis, Milo Coverdale quondam Exo-
niensis Episcopus, & Iohannes Bedford
Episcopus Suffraganeus, Mediantibus
litteris Commissionalibus Illustrissima
Regina fidei Defensatrix &c. Commissi-
onarij, cum hac clausula videlicet [una
cum Iohanne Thetfordensi Suffraganeo
& Iohanne Bale Ossoriensi Episcopo],
Et etiam cum hac clausula [Quatenus
vos aut ad minus quatuor vestrum], Nec
non & hac adiectione [Supplentes nihil
ominus &c.] specialiter & legitime
Deputati, &c. Idcirco nos Commissio-
narii Regii antedicti, de & cum assensu
Iurisperitorum cum quibus in hac parte
communicavimus, predictam Electionē
Suprema Authoritate dicta Domina no-
stra Regina nobis in hac parte Commissa
Confirmamus. Supplētes ex Suprema Au-
thoritate Regia, ex mero principis motu
& certa Scientia nobis delegata, quic-

quid in hac electione fuerit defectum. Tum in his quæ juxta mandatum nobis creditum a nobis factum & processum est, aut in nobis aut aliquo nostrum, conditione, Statu, facultate ad hæc perficienda deest aut deerit. Tum etiam eorum quæ per statuta hujus Regni Angliæ, aut per leges Ecclesiasticas in hac parte requisita sunt aut necessaria, prout temporis ratio & rerum præsentium necessitas id postulant, per hanc nostram sententiam definitivam, sive hoc nostrum finale decretum &c.

I cite this the more largely, that our Adversaries may see what use was made of the dispensation, which they cavill so much against: But in the Consecration which is an act of the Key of order, they made no use at all of it. This is likewise clearly proved by the Queenes mandate for the restitution of Arch Bishop Parker to his Temporalities, wherein there is this clause. [*Cui quidem electioni & personæ sic Electæ Regium assensum nostrum adhibuimus & favorem, ipsiusque fidelitatem nobis debitam pro dicto Archiepiscopatu recepimus.*]

Fiftbly, we say that eight daies after the
Con-

Rot.
pars
14.
2. El.

Confirmation, that is to say the 17. of December Anno 1559, the same Commissioners did proceed to the Consecration of Arch Bishop *Parker*, in the Archi-Episcopall Chappell at *Lambeth*, according to the forme prescribed by the Church of England, with solemne Praiers and Sermon, and the holy Eucharist; at which great numbers of grave persons communicated with him at that time, [*frequens gravissimorum hominum catus.*] This is proved evidently by the authentick Records of the Consecration, as they are still and alwaies have been to be seen, in the publick Registry of the Archi-Episcopall See of *Canterbury*.

Registrum Reverendissimi in Christo Patris Reg. & Domini, Domini Matthai Parker &c. Park. Principio Sacellum tapeisibus ad Orientem adornabatur, solum vero panno rubro insternebatur, 1. f. &c. And so first setting downe both how the Chappell was adorned for the Consecration, and what habit and garments as well the Consecraters as the person who was to be consecrated did weare, both at the Praiers and Sermon, as likewise at the holy Sacrament and Consecration, it proceedeth to the Consecration itself.

Finito tandem Evangelio, Herefordensis
 Electus, Bedfordensis Suffraganeus, &
 Milo Coverdale, Archiepiscopum coram
 Cicestrensi Electo apud mensam in Ca-
 thedra sedente his verbis adduxerunt,
 Reverende in Deo Pater hunc virum
 pium pariter atque doctum tibi offeri-
 mus atque presentamus, ut Archiepis-
 copus consecretur. Postquam hac dixis-
 sent, proferebatur ilico regium Diplo-
 ma sive Mandatum pro consecratione
 ArchiEpiscopi, quo per Dominum Docto-
 rem Yale legum Doctorem perlecto, Sa-
 cramentum de Regio primatu sive supre-
 ma ejus authoritate tuenda, juxta sta-
 tuta primo anno Regni Serenissima Re-
 gina nostra Elizabetha edita & promul-
 gata, ab eodem Archi-Episcopo exige-
 batur. Quod cum ille solemniter ta-
 ctis corporaliter sacris Evangeliiis, con-
 ceptis verbis prastitisset, Cicestrensis
 Electus populum ad orationem hortatus
 ad Letanias decantandas Choro respon-
 dence se accinxit. Quibus finitis, post
 questiones aliquot Archi-Episcopo per
 Cicestren-

Cicestrensem Electum propositas, & post orationes & suffragia quadam juxta formam libri auctoritate Parliamenti editi apud deum habita, Cicestrensis, Herefordensis, Suffraganeus Bedfordensis. & Milo Coverdallus, manibus Archiepiscopo impositis, dixerunt, Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, & excitare memineris gratiam Dei quæ in te est per manuum impositionem. Dedit enim nobis Deus Spiritum non timoris, sed Potestatis, Charitatis, & Sobrietatis, &c.

This is so evident that our Adversaries have nothing to say, but to crie the Records are forged. Forgery of Records is a grievous crime, and ought to be manifestly proved, or the accuser to suffer for his Calumny. Let them tell us who forged them, and when and where they were forged. But they know nothing of it. Did any of the succeeding Proto-Notaries complaine that they were forged? or so much as an under Clerke of the Office, or any man that had once occasion to view them, and afterwards found some change in them?

No

No such thing. Examine all the Officers and Notaries and Clerkes living, whether ever they observed any change in them during their remembrance ; And they will all answer, No. And so would all their predecessors since Arch-Bishop *Parkers* time have answered, if they had bee put to their Oathes. Who are they then that accuse them of Forgery ? They are the Adversaries of the Church of *England*, who never read one word of them, nor know much what belongeth to such Recordes : But they wish if they be not forged, that they were forged. What would you have men do ? If they could answer them otherwise, they would ; But they can not, and therefore they crie them downe as forged.

It is possible to forge private Acts done in a corner : But to forge a consecration done publickly at *Lambeth*, in *Queene Elisabeths* time, And to forge it so early as this was published to the world, is incredible. Surely these Fathers do not know the Customs of the Church, that all things which are done at publick Consecrations, are presently drawne into Acts by principall Notaries, and kept in publick Registries, and the custody of them committed to sworne Officers. And this practise was not begun

gun in *England* upon this occasion, but hath bee observed throughout both *Provinces* for time immemoriall. I should not wast one Penfull of inke upon an English Man, who either doth know or ought to know what credit the law of *England* doth give to these *Recordes*: But for the satisfaction of strangers who are misled by such bold calumnies, I will take leave for once to prove that, which like the common Principles of *Artes*, ought to be taken for granted, and *De quo nefas est dubitare*. Let us trie whether they can say more for the *Vatican* *Recordes*, then we can for these.

For the present, I produce six grounds to convince all those who gainsay them. The first is that value and respect which the *Lawes* of the Kingdome do give them, that is to allow them to be authentick proofes; Especially in cases of this nature, concerning Spirituall Acts belonging to the Key of Order. If a Clerke have lost his Letters of Orders, a certificate out of this Registrarie, under the Seale of the Arch-Bishop, or the hand of the Protonotary, is an authentick proofe. Shall two or three Adversaries, who are strangers
and

and know little of our affaires , altogether unacquainted with our Lawes and Records, dare without any ground to defame that for forged , which the Lawes of the Kingdome do allow for authentick? Either these Records are authentick , or Christendome never had an authentick Ecclesiasticall Record. The very Acts of our Synods or Convocations are not more undoubted , then these are.

My second prooffe is taken from the credit of the Publick Notaries , who did testifie this individuall Consecration , and draw it up into Acts. The Testimony of two publick Notaries , for matter of fact maketh full prooffe over all *Europe*: but here at least foure Publick Notaries were present at this Consecration , and testified the truth of these Acts ; Whereof two of them were the Principall Publick Notaries in *England*, that is, *Anthony Huse* protonotary of the See of *Canterbury* , and *Thomas Argall* Register of the Prerogative Court, assisted in actuating this Consecration, by *Thomas Willet* and *Iohn Iucent* Publick Notaries. Who can make doubt of a matter of fact so attested?

But

But is it further Observable that these foure publick Notaries were the same who did draw Cardinall Poles Consecration into Acts, and attest them. Either let these Fathers denie that Cardinall Pole was Consecrated, or let them grant that Archbishop Parker was Consecrated. *Aut utramque negare, aut utrumque concedere.* There are the same Proofes for the one and for the other. There needeth no more to be done to satisfie any man that hath eyes in his head, but to compare the one Register with the other,

We owe a third ground to the Queenes extraordinary care, who was so solicitous least some Circumstance in the Politicall part might be defective in some *punctilio* of law, by reason of the frequent change of the Statutes in the reignes of her Father, Brother, Sister, and Her self, that she caused the Letters Patents to be carefully perused by six of our most eminent Lawiers, who all with one unanimous consent did certifie, that the Commission was good in law, and that the Consecraters might proceed legally to Consecration upon it; which Certificate subscribed with their

their owne hands is preserved in the Records. So if these Records be forged, not onely the Acts of the Principall Notaries of *England*, but also the hands of the Principall Lawiers of *England* must be forged for company, which is incredible.

The fourth ground is irrefragable, taken from the testimony and authority of the Parliament of *England*, in the eighth yeare of *Queen Elisabeth*, that was about six yeares after this Consecration was acted; which speaking of the great care was taken in and about the Elections, Confirmations, and Consecrations of Arch-Bishop *Parker*, and the rest of those first Bishops in *Queene Elisabeths* time, for prooffe thereof referreth us to these very Records, [*As the Records of her Majesties said Fathers and Brothers time, and also her owne time, will more plainly testifie and declare*]. Doth the Parliament referre subjects to Records which are forged? You see the contrary, that it mentioneth them as authentick, undoubted, undeniable proofes of what was really done.

8. El.
c. 1.

To

To this unanswerable reason, these Fathers pretend to give two answers: But they are such as are able to satisfy any man, that no answer is to be expected. The first answer is in their printed booke pag. 16, that *the word Recordes is but a generall terme*. As if truth ought not to be regarded in generalls; as well as in particulars. Yet the termes which are added to *Recordes*, that is, [*of her Fathers time, her brothers time, and her time*], are no generall but restraining termes.

They adde, that *it is a word of course, which men do rather suppose then examine, when they mention things that have been practised in former times*. What latitude these Fathers may allow their *Consent* in case Theology for words of *Course*, I do not now examine; but what have words of *Course* to do in a printed law? They might as well tell the Parliament in plaine termes, that they lied, or that they spake they knew not or regarded not what; as tell them that their words were but *words of course*. If these wordes of course were not true, why did not they confute them then, when all things were fresh in mens memories? No man
can

can beleevē that they did forbear out of affection to the Parliament, but because they could not then oppose so evident truth.

Yet they conclude it to be evident, *that there were no such Recordes of Parkers consecration.* This is more then words of course, to charge the Parliament directly with an untruth. But how is it evident that there were no such Recordes? because *they were never produced to those Roman Catholick Doctors, who desired to see some evidence of Parkers Consecration.* This is wonderfull, They were cited in printe, they were alleged by the Parliament in the Publick *Laws* of the Kingdome, of which no man can pleade ignorance; and yet they tell us they were never produced. But to satisfie their very pretensions. Their exceptions in those daies were of another nature, either against our English Ordinall, or against the *Legality* of our Bishops; which later exception hath been answered already, and the former shall be answered in due place. The reason why Bishop *Jewell*, and Bishop *Horne*, and others did not cite these Recordes more expressely, was no dread at all least they should be found to be counterfeit, but because they had no
need

need to cite them, to answer any thing that was objected against them. Either the Roman Catholick writers of those daies were false to their owne interest, to shew
 ther a thing which (if it had been true) had been so much to their advantage; which no rationall man can imagine: Or the *Nagges head* Ordination was altogether unknowne and unheard of in those daies; which is most certaine.

But now the Fathets change their note, *could they not be forged as well in Queene Elisabeths time as in King Iames his reigned* This is to blow hote and cold with the same breath. Before they demanded, *how it was possible they should be extant then and not produced?* Now they tell us, they might be extant then, and yet forged: Nay, such a dexterity they have in turning all which they touch into gold, that they make this very supposition that they were extant then, to be a prooffe against us that they were forged. Therefore they were not produced, because in *Queene Elisabeths time many were living, who would have proved them to be forged.*

Observe first, what honour and respect
 H our

our Countrymen do beare to our Princes and Parliaments united. Before they did as good as gave them the lie, And now they make them at the least Accessaries to forgery, so farre as to avouch and justifie forged Recordes. Secondly observe, with what confidence and conscience they say that these Recordes were never produced: And yet confesse that they were cited in Printe, and alleged in our very Statutes. If Bishop *Iewell* and Bishop *Horne* had cited them, (as they would have cited them if they had had occasion), they could have done no more then was done. Did any man upon this publication go about to convince them of forgery? No I warrant you, The case was too plaine to be convinced. The Parliament, and the booke of the lives of the seventy Arch Bishops of *Canterbury* printed by *Iohn Day Anno 1572.* have spoiled the Fathers Arguments, [*They were not produced, therefore they were forged*], and furnished us with a demonstrative prooffe of the contrary. They were produced and cited in printe, and neither convinced, nor so much as accused of forgery; Therefore they were not forged.

It seemeth this answer did not satisfie

th

the Fathers themselves: and therefore the one of them hath addeth a second answer in the margent, with his penne, in these words; *The Act of Parliament relates onely to the Recordes of the Queenes Letters Patents, and not to the Recordes of the Bishops Consecration or Ordination.* They say that glosse is accursed which corrupteth and Contradicteth the text, as this glosse doth egregiously. The Statute speaketh expressly, of *the Recordes of Elections and Confirmations and Consecrations*, which are all of them Ecclesiasticall Acts, and none of them Recorded in the Rolles of Chancery, or any other civill Court of Recordes, but onely in the Ecclesiasticall Registers of the Arch-Bishops, Deanes and Chapiters respectively. This answer is a groundlesse evasion.

My fifth ground to prove that these Recordes were not forged, is taken from that booke of the lives of the seventy succeeding Arch-Bishops of *Canterbury*, printed in *London* in the yeare 1572; wherein the Authour, (that was Arch Bishop *Parker* himself,) having described the Confirmations and Consecrations of Bishop *Grindall*,

Bishop Sands , Bishop Iewell , Bishop Horne , and all the rest of those first Protestant Bishops , he adderh in the margin , *Ha confirmationes & consecrationes in Registris apparent :* " These confirmations and consecrations de appeare in the Registers. Then the Registers were then extant, and not onely extant but publickly printed, whilest all things were fresh in mens memories , yet no man did or durst except against the truth of them ; So free they were not onely from corruption , but from suspicion.

The sixth and last ground to prove that the Recordes were not forged , is taken from the agreement and concurrence of our civill Recordes (which no man ever doubted of) with our Ecclesiasticall Registers. We have seene the Queenes Letters Patêts, directed to seven other Bishops, for the confirmation and consecration of Arch-Bishop Parker, dated the sixth of December anno 1559; Therefore upon the sixth of December 1559 he was neither Confirmed nor Consecrated. We have seene the Ecclesiasticall Recordes , how by virtue of those very Letters Patents, he was confirmed upon the ninth day , and consecrated upon the seventeenth day of the same Moneth.

Moneth. We find three other Letters Patents, directed to Arch-Bishop Parker himself as a Consecrated Bishop, for the Confirmation and Consecration of other Bishops; namely *Richard Coxe*, *Edmund Grindall*, and *Edwin Sandes*, dated the Eighteenth of *December*, that is the very next day after his consecration: Therefore he was then consecrated. And this agreeth exactly with the Ecclesiasticall Register.

Elisabeth Dei gratia Anglia &c. Reverendissimo in Christo Patri & Domino, Matthæo Archi-Episcopo Cantuariensi, totius Angliæ Primati & Metropolitano, &c. Salutem. Rogantes, ac in fide & dilectione quibus nobis tenemini firmiter precipiendo mandantes, quatenus eundem magistrum Edmundum Grindall in Episcopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Divi Pauli London prædictæ sic ut præfertur Electum, Electionemque prædictam Confirmare, & eundem magistrum Edmundum Grindall in Episcopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ prædictæ consecrare, ceteraque omnia & singula peragere, quæ vestro in hac
parie

*parte incumbunt Officio pastoralis &c.
 Teste Regina apud Westmonasterium, de-
 cimo Octavo die Decembris, Anno Re-
 gina Elizabeth Angliæ &c. secundo.*

Examinatur per

RICH: BROUGHTON.

*Consimilia Brevia (Eisdem forma &
 verbis , mutatis solummodo Mutandis)
 directâ sunt eidem Matthæo Archi-
 Episcopo Cantuariensi , pro confirma-
 tione Electionis , & consecratione Ri-
 chardi Cox Sacra Theologiæ Professoris
 in Episcopum Eliensem , Et Edwini
 Sands sacra Theologiæ Professoris in
 Episcopum Vigornensem, Omnia sub
 dato predicto & in Rotulo supradicto.*

Examinatur per

RICHARDUM BROUGHTON,

There cannot be a clearer prooffe in the
 world, to prove that Arch-Bishop Parker
 was neither confirmed nor Consecrated
 upon the sixth of December Anno 1559,
 and

and that he was both Confirmed and Consecrated; and commanded to Consecrate others, upon the eighteenth of the same moneth. Neither doth the King, or Church, or Lawes of *England*, take notice of any man as a true Arch-Bishop or Bishop, untill hands be imposed upon him, but alwaies with this addition [*Elect*] as in the booke of Ordination, *Ego I. N. Ecclesie atque sedis N. Elec us Episcopus profiteor.* And in the letany, *Te Rogamus ut huic fratri nostro Electro Episcopo Benedictionem & gratiam tuam largiri digneris.*

Lastly, by the lawes of *England*, a Bishop can not be admitted to do his homage or sweare fealty for his Bishoprick, nor be restored to his Temporalties, untill he be legally Consecrated: But it is Apparent by the Queenes Letters Patents, dated the one and twentieth day of *March* following, (that was at the end of Hilary terme, as speedily as could be) he had done his homage, and was then restored to his Temporalties. Which proveth clearly, that he was legally Consecrated, that is to say, according to the Register. Such a perpetuall agreement there is, between our Ecclesiasticall Recordes and our Civill Recordes.

C H A P T. V.

*The eighth ninth and tenth reasons
against that fabulous relation,
from the Authority of our Statute,
the booke of the lives of the Arch-
Bishops of Canterbury, and all
sorts of witnesses.*

*The
eighth
reason.*

THe eighth reason to prove the *Nagges-*
head Ordinatio to be a fable, is take from
the authority of the Statute in the eighth
yeare of Queene *Elisabeth*, which is thus
entituled. *An Act declaring the manner of*
making and Consecrating of the Arch-Bishops
and Bishops of this Realme, to be good lawfull
and perfect. [*An Act declaring*] not ena-
cting or making; [*the manner of making and*
Consecrating the Arch Bishops and Bishops of
this Realme,] that is, those in the beginning
of Queene *Elisabeths* time, as appeareth by
the whole body of the Act; [*to be good law-*
full and perfect. The title of the Statute
alone is sufficient to confute this fable: But
there is much more in the body of the Sta-
tute; As where it approveth the making and
consecrating of the same Arch Bishops and Bi-
shops

shops to be duely and orderly done, according to the lawes of this Realme. If it was done duely and orderly according to the lawes of this Realme, then it was not done at the *Nagges head*, nor after such a silly ridiculous manner, as these Fathers do relate it. That forme differeth from our forme in all things. In the Consecrater, or Minister of the Consecration: We must have three Bishops at the least, there was but one. In the matter: Our matter is Imposition of handes, their matter was the laying the Bible upon the head or shoulders of the person Consecrated. In the forme: Our forme is *receve the holy Ghost &c.* Their forme was, *Take thou Authority to preach the word of God sincerely.*

The Statute proceedeth, that *they were elected made and consecrated Arch Bishops and Bishops, according to such order and forme, and with such Ceremonies in and about their Consecrations, as were allowed and set forth by the said Acts Statutes and Orders, annexed to the said booke of Common praier before mentioned.* This is plaine enough. If the Parliament say truely, then they were

were Consecrated in a Church, not in a Taverne; not according to the Brainfick whimsies of a self conceited Foole, or rather the ludicrous devise of an Archenemy, but according to the forme prescribed by the Church and Kingdome. The Parliament had more reason to know the truth then these Fathers, for there were personally present both the persons who did consecrate, and the persons who were consecrated, and many Lords and Gentlemen who were eye witnesses of the consecration. Chuse Reader, whether thou wilt trust the tale of a single, obscure, malicious spie, tatling in a corner: or the asservation of the Parliament of England, in the face of the sun, published to the world in print.

The Parliament testifieth further, that it is and may be very evident and apparent, that *no cause of scruple ambiguity or doubt can or may justly be objected, against the said Elections Confirmations or Consecrations*. Do they thinke the Parliament would have given such a testimony for the Nagges head Consecrations. And so they conclude, that *all persons which had been or should be ordered or consecrated, after the forme and order prescribed in the said English Ordinall, were in*

very

very deed, and by auctority of Parliament were declared and enacted to be rightly Ordered and Consecrated. The scope of the Parliament and of this Act, was to confirme the consecration of Arch Bishop *Parker* and the rest of the Bishops, and to free them from cavills and objections: But they confirme no Ordination at the *Nagges head*, neither can their words be extended any way to such a ridiculous Consecration: Therefore the Ordination of Arch Bishop *Parker* and the rest, was no *Nagges head* Ordination.

My ninth reason to prove that *Nagges-head* Relation fabulous and counterfeit, is taken from the Testimony of that book formerly mentioned, of the lives of the seventy Arch Bishops of *Canterbury*; wherein the Consecrations of Arch Bishop *Parker* and all the rest are particularly related. That which was published to the world in print, above thirty yeares before the death of Queene *Elisabeth*, was not lately forged: But the legall Ordinations of Arch-Bishop *Parker* and the rest, according to the Register, was published to the world in print, above thirty yeares before the death of Queene *Elisabeth*. Again, that which was published to the world in print with the allowance of

of Arch Bishop *Parker*, or rather by Arch Bishops *Parker* himself, was not intended by Arch Bishop *Parker* to be smothered or concealed. Men do not use to publish their forgeries in print; especially so soone, and of such publick actions, whilst there are so many eye witnesses living. That the Relation was not confuted, That the Author was never called to an account for it, That no man stood up against the Registers, nor on the behalf of the *Nagges head* Ordination in those daies, That Mr. *Neale* was so tame to endure the lie in print and all his party so silent, at that time when the truth might so easily have been discovered, as if it had bene written with a beame of the sun, (as it was indeed); is an evident prooffe that our Relation is undeniable, and the Relation which these Fathers make is but a drowsy dreame, which could not indure the light of the sun.

*The
tenth
reason.*

The tenth and last reason to prove our Relation true and theirs fabulous, is taken from all sortes of witnesses, ours and theirs indifferently. Mr *Mason* reckoneth up seven of our writers, who had justified

fied the legality of our Ordinations, and cited our Registers as authentick Records, before himself; Bishop *Iewell*, Bishop *Hall*, Bishop *Goodwin*, Doctor *Collings*, Mr. *Camden*, Mr. *Shelden*, and one who was then living when this question was so hotely debated in King *James* his time, and had been an eye-witnesse of Arch Bishop *Parkers* Consecrations at *Lambeth*, that was the *Earle of Nottingham*. One that was, well stored with our English writers in Queene *Elisabeths* time, might adde many more: But that can not well be expected from me at this distance.

We may produce as many of theirs, who have confessed or been convinced of the truth of Arch Bishop *Parkers* Consecration. First Mr. *Clerke*, whose Father was Register to Cardinall *Pole* in his Legantine Courte, and he himself an Actuary under him, when *Theophilus Higgins* fled out of England to *St. Omars*, or *Doway*, (I remember not well whether). There he met with this Mr. *Clerke*, who falling into discourse with him concerning his Reasons why he had

had forsaken the Church of England, Mr. Higgins told him, that one of them was that saying of St. Hierome, *It is no Church which hath no Priests*; reflecting upon this Nagges head Consecration. Mr. Clerke approved well of his Caution, because *In dubiis tutior pars sequenda*: but withall he wished, that what their Authours had written concerning that point, could be made good; confessing that he himself was in England at that time, (The witness doth not positively remember whether at the Consecration or not.) But Mr. Clerke said that he himself was present when the Advocate of the Arches, whom the Queene sent to peruse the Register after the Consecration, and to give her an account whether it was performed Canonically, returned her this answer, that *he had perused the Register, and that no just exception could be made against the Consecration, But* (he said) *something might have been better, particularly that Bishop Coverdale was not in his Rochet,* But he assured her, *that could make no defect in the Consecration.* Here we have, if not an eye witness, yet at least an eare witness in an undoubted manner, of the legall

legall Consecration, and of the truth of the Register, and of the judgement of the Advocate of the Arches, concerning the Canonallnesse of the Consecration. Thus much *Mr. Higgins* was ready to make faith of whilest he was living, and *Mr. Barwick* a person of very good credit, from him of at this present.

The second witness is *Mr. Higgins* himself, who coming afterwards into England had a desire to see the Register, and did see it, and finding those expresse words in it [*Milo vero Coverdallus non nisi togalanea talari utebatur,*] and remembring withall what *Mr. Clerke* had told him, whereas the Canonick garments of the rest of the Bishops are particularly described: he was so fully satisfied of the truth of the Consecration, and lawfull succession of our English Bishops, that he said he never made doubt of it afterwards.

My third witness is *Mr. Hart*, a stiffe Roman Catholick, but a very ingenuous person, who having seene undoubted copies of Doctor *Reynolds* his Ordination by Bishop *Freake*, and of Bishop *Freakes* Consecration by ArchBishop *Parker*, and lastly of ArchBishop *Parkers* owne Consecration: he was so fully satisfied with it, that he himself

self did rase out all that part of the conference betweene him and Doctor Reinoldes.

My fourth witnesse is Father Oldcorne the Iesuit. This testimony was urged by me in my treatise of Schisme in these words. *These authentick evidences being upon occasion produced, out of our Ecclesiasticall Courtes, and deliberately perused and viewed by Father Oldcorne the Iesuit, he both confessed himselfe clearly convinced of that whereof he had so long doubted, (that was the legitimate succession of Bishops and Priests in our Church) and wished heartily towards the reparation of the breach of Christendome, that all the world were so abundantly satisfied as he himself was; blaming us as partly guilty of the grosse mistake of many, for not having publickly and timely made knowne to the world, the notorious falshood of that empty, but farre spread aspersiō against our succession.* To this the Bishop of Chalcodon, who was better acquainted with the passages of those times in England, then any of those persons whom these Fathers

thers stile of *undoubted credit*, makes this
 confession: *That father Oldcorne being*
in hold for the powder treason, and
judging others by himself, should say,
those Registers to be authentick, is no
marvell,

Survey
c. 9. p.
122.

A fifth witnesse is Mr. Wadsworth,
 who in an Epistle to a freind in England
 doth testifie, that *before he left England he*
read the Consecration of Arch Bishop Parker
in our Registers. This made him to mode-
 rate above his fellowes, that whereas some
 of them tell of five, and the most of them
 of fifteen, which were consecrated at the
 Nagges head, he saith onely that the con- *In Ep.*
 secration of the first Protestant Bishop was at- *ad ami.*
 tempted there, but not accomplished. If it were *n. 5.*
 onely attempted not accomplished, then
 the Nagges head Ordination is a fable.
 But it falleth out very unfortunately for Mr
 Wadsworths attempt, that of all those first
 Protestant Bishops, whose elections were
 all confirmed at Bowes Church about that
 time, (And it might be all of them, it is
 very probable fundry of them had a confir-
 mation dinner at the Nagges head) not one
 was confirmed in person, but all of
 them by their Proxies: Arch Bishop
 Parker by Doctor Bullingham, Bishop
 I Barlow

Barlow and Bishop *Scory* by *Walter Iones* Bachelour of Law, Bishop *Grindall* by *Thomas Hink* Doctor of Law, Bishop *Cox* by *Edward Gascoine*, Bishop *Sands* by *Thomas Bentham*, &c; as appeareth by the authentick Records of their confirmation. Bishops are ordinarily confirmed by Proxie, but no man was ever consecrated, no man was ever attempted to be consecrated by Proxie.

The four next witnesses are *Mr. Collinson*, *Mr. Laibwait*, *Mr. Faircloth*, and *Mr. Leake*, two of them of the same order with these Fathers; to whom the ArchBishop of *Canterbury* caused these Records to be shewed, in the presence of himself, the Bishops of *London*, *Durham*, *Ely*, *Bath* and *Welles*, *Lincolne*, and *Rocheſter*. They viewed the Register, they turned it over and over, and perused it as much as they pleased, and in Conclusion gave this sentence of it, that *the booke was beyond exception*. To say, that afterwards they desired to have the Records into prison, to peruse them more fully, is ridiculous. Such Records may not goe out of the presence of the Keeper. But these Fathers may see them as much as they list in the Registrie, if they seeke for satisfaction, not altercation.

Lastly

Laſtly Biſhop *Bonner* had a ſuite with Biſhop *Horne*, and the iſſue was whether Biſhop *Horne* were legally conſecrated Biſhop; upon that ſcruple, or rather cavill, which I have formerly mentioned. If Mr. *Neale* who they ſay was Biſhop *Bonnors* Chaplein, and ſent on purpoſe to ſpie what the biſhops did, could have proved the ordination of Biſhop *Horne* at the *Nagges head*, he might not onely have cleared his Maſter, but have turned Biſhop *Horne* deſervedly out of his Biſhoprick. But he was loath to forfeit his cares, by avouching ſuch a palpable lie. The *Nagges head* Ordination was not talked of in thoſe daies. How ſhould it, before it was firſt deviſed? Mr. *Sanders* dedicated a booke to ArchBiſhop *Parker*, which he called *the Rock of the Church*: If the *Nagges head* Ordination had bene a ſerious truth, how would he have triumphed over the poore Arch-Biſhop?

To conclude, If faith ought to be given to concurring Records Eccleſiaſticall and civill, of the Church and Kingdome of *England*, If a full Parliament of the whole Kingdome deſerve any credit, If the teſtimony of the moſt eminent publick Notaries in the Kingdome, If witneſſes without

exception, If the silence, or contradiction, or confession of knowne Adversaries, be of any force, If the strongest presumptions in the world may have any place, that men in their right wittes will not ruine themselves willfully. without necessity, or hope of advantage, If all these grounds put together do over ballance the clandestine Relation of a single malicious Spie, without either oath, or any other obligation: then I hope every one who readeth these grounds will conclude with me, that the Register of the Church of England is beyond all exception, and the malicious Relation of the *Nagges head* Ordination, a very tale of a tub, and no better; so full of Ridiculous folly in it self, that I wonder how any prudent man can relate it without laughter.

Who told this to *Bluet*? *Neale*. Who told this to *Haberley*? *Neale*. Who told it to the rest of the Prisoners at *Wisbich*? *Neale*. Onely *Neale*. Who suggested it to *Neale*? The Father of lies. *Neale* made the fable, *Neale* related it in Corners, long after the time it was pretended to be acted. If his Maister Bishop Bonner had knowne any thing of it, we had heard of it long before. That the Arch-Bishop should leave *Lambeth*

beth to come to London to be consecrated;
 That he should leave all those Churches
 in London, which are immediately under
 his owne Iurisdiction, to chuse a common
 taverne, as the fittest place for such a worke;
 That Bishop Bonner being deprived of his
 Bishoprick, and a prisoner in London,
 should send Neale from Oxford, and
 send a command by him to one over whom
 he never had any Iurisdiction; That the
 other Bishop being then a Protestant
 should obey him being a Roman Catho-
 lick, when there were so many Churches
 in the City to performe that worke in,
 where the Bishop of London never pre-
 tended any Iurisdiction; That these things
 should be treated, and concluded, and
 executed all at one meeting; that Bishop
 Bonner did foresee it would be so, And
 command his servant to attend there untill
 he see the end of that businesse. That the Bi-
 shops being about such a Clandestine
 worke, should suffer a knowne enemy
 to stay all the while in their com-
 pany, is incredible. If *Neale* had fei-
 ned that he had heard it from one of
 the Drawers boies, it had deserved mo-
 re credit, then this silly, improbable

inconsistent Relation; which looketh more like an heape of fictions made by severall Authours by starts, then a continued Relation of one man,

Quicquid ostendas mihi sic incredulus odi.

C H A P T. VI.

The Nagges head Ordination is but a late devise. Of the Earle of Nottingham, Bishop Bancroft, Doctor Stapleton, the Statute 8. El. 1. And the Queenes dispensation.

NOW having laid our grounds, in the next place let us see what the Fathers have to say further for themselves. This story of the Naggeshead was first contradicted by Mason in the yeare 1613: yet so weakly and faintly that the attentive Reader may easily perceive he feared to be caught in a lie. First, the Fathers seem to argue after this manner; Many Athenian writers did mention the Cretan Bulls and Minotaurs and Labyrinth, but no Cretan did write against them, therefore those ridiculous Fables were true. Rather, the Cretans laughed at

at their womannish revenge, to thinke to repaire themselves for a beating, with scolding and lying : such ridiculous Fictions ought to be entertained with scorn and contempt, *Spreta exolescunt, sircaricis agnita videntur.* Secondly, it might be (for any thing I know to the contrary) Mr. *Mason* was the first who dissected this lie, and laid the falsity of it open to the world : but he was not the first who avouched and justified the Canonick Consecration, and personall Succession of our Protestant Bishops, which is the same thing in effect ; the Bishop of *Hereford* did it before him, and Doctor *Reynolds* before the Bishop of *Hereford*, and he that writ the life of Arch-Bishop *Parker* before Doctor *Reynolds*, and the Parliament before him that writ Arch Bishop *Parkers* life, and the publick Registers of the Church before the Parliament.

Thirdly, they would make us believe that this Fable was ancient, and published to the world from the beginning of Queen *Elisabeths* time in print, and unanswered by the Protestants untill the 13, of King *James* : but there is no such thing. For their credit, let them produce one Authour that mentioneth it in the beginning of

Queen Elisabeths time, or if they cannot doe that, for forty yeares after, that is, before the yeare 1600: or otherwise the case is plain that it is an upstart lie, newly coined about the beginning of King James his time; the Fathers would not have us answer it before it was coined, or before it was known to us.

Where they say that Mr. Mason did handle this Controversy weakly and faintly, they know they doe him wrong: He hath so thrashed their Authours, Fusherbert, and Fitz-Simon, and Holywood, and Constable, and Kellison, and Champney, that the cause hath wanted a Champion ever since, untill these Fathers tooke up the Bucklers. But whereas they adde, that Mr. Mason *was affraid to be convinced by some aged persons that might then be living, and remember what passed in the beginning of Queen Elisabeths reign; is so farre from truth, that Mr. Mason nameth a witnessse beyoud all exception, that was invited to ArchBishop Parkers Consecration at Lambeth, as being his Kinsman, and was present there, The Earle of Nottingham Lord High Admirall of England.*

Why

Why did none of their Authors goe to him, or imploy some of their Friends to inquire of him? The case is cleare, they were more affraid of Conviction, and to be caught in a lie, then *Mr. Mason*: who laid not the Foundation of his Discourse upon loose prittle-prattle, but upon the Firm Foundation of Originall Records.

They say, in the year 1603, none of the Protestant Clergy durst call it a fable, as some now doe. I am the man, I did call it so, I do call it so. Such a blind relation as this is, of a businessse pretended to be acted in the year 1559, being of such consequence, as whereupon the succession of the Church of England did depend, and never published untill after the year 1600, as if the Church of England had neither Friends nor Enemies; deserveth to be stiled a *Tale of a Tub* and no better.

They adde, *Bancroft Bishop of London* being demanded by *Mr. William Alabaster*, how *Parker* and his Collegues were consecrated Bishops? answered, he hoped that in Case of necessity a Priest (alluding to *Scory*, might

might ordein Bishops. This answer of his was objected in Print by Holywood, against him and all the English Clergy in the yeare 1603, not a word replied, Bancroft himself being then living. And why might not Holywood be misinformed of the Bishop of London, as well as you yourselves were misinformed of the Bishop of Durham? This is certain, he could not allude to Bishop Scory, who was consecrated a Bishop in the reign of Edward the sixth, as by the Records of those times appeareth; ulesse you have a mind to accuse all Records of Forgery. If you have any thing to say against Bishop Scoryes Consecration, or of any of them who joined in Ordeining Arch Bishop Parker, spare it not, we wil not seek help of an Act of Parliament to make it good.

In summe, I doe not believe a word of what is said of Bishop Bancroft, *sub modo* as it is here set down, nor that this Accusation did ever come to the knowledge of that prudent Prelate; if it did, he had greater matters to trouble his head withall, then Mr. Holywoods bables: but if ever such a question was proposed to him, it may be after a clear answer to the matter of Fact,
 he

he might urge this as *argumentum ad hominem*; that though both Bishop Scory and Bishop Coverdale had been but simple Priests, (as they were complete Bishops), yet joining with Bishop Barlow and Bishop Hodgskings, two undoubted Bishops (otherwile Gardiner and Bonner and Tunstall and Thurleby and the rest were no Bishops,) the Ordination was as Canonically, as for one Bishop and two Mitred Abbats to consecrate a Bishop (which you allow in case of Necessity), or one Bishop and two simple Presbyters to consecrate a Bishop by Papall Dispensation. So this question will not concern us at all, but them very much, to reconcile themselves to themselves. They teach that the matter and form of Ordination are essentials of Christs own Institution, They teach that it is grievous Sacrilege to change the matter of this Sacrament, They teach that the matter of Episcopall Ordination is Imposition of hands of three Bishops, upon the person consecrated: and yet with them one Bishop and two Abbats, or one Bishop and two simple Priests extraordinarily by Papall dispensation, may ordein Bishops. The essentials of Sacraments doe consist in *indivisibili*, once Essentiall

tiall alwaies Essentiall, whether ordinarily, or extraordinarily whether with dispensation or without. So this Question whether a Priest in case of Necessity may ordein Bishops, doth concern them much, but us not at all. But for my part I believe the whole Relation is feined, for so much as concerneth Bishop *Bancroft*.

They adde, or the one of them, *I have spoken vvith both Catholicks and Protestants, that remember neare 80. yeares, and acknowledge that so long they have heard the Nagges head story related as an undoubted truth. Where I wonder? sooner in Rome or Rhe-mes or Doway, then in England, and sooner in a Corner then upon the Exchange. You have heard from good Authors of the Swans singing, and the Pellicans pricking of her Breast with her bill: but you are wiser then to believe such groundlesse Fictions. I produce you seven of the ancient Bishops of England, some of them neare an 100. yeares old, who doe testify that it is a groundlesse Fable: yet they have more reason to know the right value of our Eccle-siasticall Records, and the truth of our*
affaires.

affaires, then any whom you converse withall:

The Authours proceed, *This Narration of the Consecration at the Nagges head, have I taken out of Holywood, Constable, and Doctor Champnies wverkes.* They heard it from many of the ancient Clergy, *vvho vvvere Prisoners for the Catholick Religion in Wysbich Castle, as Mr. Blewer, Doctor Watson, Bishop of Lincoln, and others. These had it from the said Mr. Neale and other Catholicks present at Parkers Consecration in the Nagges head, as Mr. Constable affirms* Here is nothing but hearsay, upon hearsay, such Evidence would not passe at a tryall for a lock of Goats weoll. *Holywood* and the rest had it from some of the *Wysbich* Prisoners: and the *Wysbich* Prisoners heard it from *Mr. Neale* and others.

What others? had they no names? did Bishop *Bonner* send more of his Chapleins then one to be Spectators of the Consecration, and they who were to be
confe-

consecrated permit them being Adversaries to continue among them, during the Consecration, supposed to be a Clandestine Action. It is not credible, without a Plot between *Neale* and the Host of the *Nagges head*, to put him and his fellowes for that day into Drawers habits, least the Bishops should discover them. Here is enough said to disgrace this Narration for ever, that the first Authors that published it to the world, did it after the yeare 1600; untill then it was kept close in Lavander. Bishop *Watson* lived splendidly with the Bishops of *Ely* and *Rocheſter*, at the time of Arch-Bishop *Parkers* Consecration, and a long time after, before he was removed to *Wisbich* Castle. If there had been any such thing really acted, and so notoriously known, as they pretend, Bishop *Watson* and the other Prisoners, must needs have known it long before that time, when Mr. *Neale* is supposed to have brought them the first newes of it. The whole story is composed of Inconsistences. That which quite spoileth their story, is that Arch-Bishop *Parker* was never present at any of these Consecrations, otherwise called Confirmation Dinners: but it may be the merry Host shewed Mr. *Neale* Doctor

Bullingham

Bullingham for Arch Bishop *Parker*, and told him what was done in the withdrawing roome, which (to gaine more credit to his Relation) he feigued that he had seen, out of pure zeale.

Howsoever, they say the Story was divulged to the great grieve of the newly Consecrated, yet being so evident a truth they durst not contradict it. We must suppose that these Fathers have a Privilege to know other mē's hearts, but let that passe. Let them tell us how it was divulged by word or writing, when and where it was divulged whilest they were newly consecrated, who divulged it and to whom? If they can tell us none of all this, it may passe for a great presumption, but it cannot passe for a prooffe,

But they say, that not onely the Nullity of the Consecration, but also the illegality of the same was objected in Print against them not long after, by that famous writer Doctor Stapleton and others. We looke upon Doctor Stapleton, as one of the most Rationall heads that your Church hath had since the separation: but speake to the purpose. Fathers, did Doctor Stapleton print one word of the *Nagges head* Consecration. You may be sure he would not have balked it, if there had been any such thing, but he did balke it

it because there was no such thing. No, no, Doctr. Stapletons pretended illegality was upon another ground, because he dreamed that King Edwards Statute was repealed by Queen Mary, and not restored by Queen Elisabeth, for which we have an expresse Act of Parliament against him in the point: and his supposed invalidity was because they were not consecrated *rum Romano*. If you think Doctor Stapleton hath said any thing that is materiall, to prove the invalidity or nullity of our Consecration, take your bowes and arrowes and shoote over his shafts againe, and try if you do not meet with satisfactory answers, both for the Institution of Christ, and the Canons of the Catholick Church, and the Lawes of England.

You say, Parker and the rest of the Protestant Bishops, not being able to answer the Catholick arguments against the invalidity of their Ordination &c. Words are but wind. The Church of England wanted nor Orthodox Sonnes enough to cope with Stapleton and all the rest of your Emislaries: nor to cry down the illogall and extravagant manner of it at the Nagges head. How should they cry down, that which never had been cryed up in those daies? We condemne, that
which

form of Ordination which you feign to have beē used at the *Nagges head*, as illegall, and *extravagant*, and (which weigheth more then both of them) invalid, as much as yourselves.

They were forced to begge an act of Parliament, whereby they might enjoy the *Temporalities*, not withstanding the known defects of their Consecration &c. O Ingenuity! whither art thou Fled out of the world? Say, where is this Petition to be found, in the Records of *Eutopia*? Did the Parliament ever make any such establishment of their *Temporalities*, more then of their *Spiritualties*? Did the Parliament ever take any notice of any Defects of their Consecration? Nay, did not the Parliament declare their Consecration to have been free from all defects? Nay, doth not the Parliament quite contrary, brand these Reports for *slandorous speeches*, 8. *Elis.* and justify their Consecrations to have been *cap. 1.* *duely and orderly done*, according to the *Lawes of this Realm*: and that it is very evident and apparent, that no cause of scruple ambiguity or doubt, can be justly objected against their Elections Confirmations or Consecrations.

Yet they give a reason of what they say, for albeit Edward the sixths rite of Ordination was reestablished by Act of

Parliament in the first yeare of *Queen Eliza-*
beth: yet it was notorious that the Ordination
 at the *Nagges head* was very different from it,
 and formed extempore by *Scoryes Puritani-*
call Spirit &c. I take that which you grant
 out of *Sanders*; that *King Edwards* Form
 of Ordination, was reestablished by Act of
 Parliament 1. *Elisabeitha*; wherein you doe
 unwittingly condemne both *Bishop Bonners*
 and *Stapletons* plea of illegality. The rest
 which you say is partly true and partly false.
 It is very true that there is great difference
 between the English Form of Ordeining,
 and your *Nagges head* Ordination, as much
 as is between the head of a living horse and
 the sign of the *Nagges head*, or between
 that which hath a reall entity and an ima-
 ginary *Chimera* (*Mr. Mason* was the
Bellerephon that destroyed this monster): But
 that the Form of the *Nagges head* Ordina-
 tion was framed extempore by *Scoryes Puri-*
tanicall Spirit, is most false; That *Posthu-*
mus brat was the *Minerva* or Issue of *Mr.*
Neales brain, or some others who fathered
 this rapping lie upon him.

Then they repeat the words of a part of
 the Statute, and thence conclude, *By which*
Act appeares that not onely *King Edwards*
 rise,

rite, but any other used since the beginning of the *Queens* reign, upon her Commission was enacted for good, and consequently that of the *Nagges* head might passe. *Cujus contrarium verum est.*

The Contrary to what these Fathers inferre, doth follow necessarily from these words which the Fathers cite. The words of the Act are these, [*By virtue of the Queens Letters Patents or Commission*]: Every one of the Letters Patents is extant in the Rolles; not one of them did ever authorise any form but that which was legally established; that is, the Form of *Edward* the sixth. First, the *Queens* Letters Patents or Commission hath an *aut minus* in it, or at the least three or foure of you: but to justify the *Nagges* head Ordination, the *aut minus* must be altered to at the least one or two of you. Secondly, the *Queens* Letters Patents have alwaies this clause in them: *Iuxta Formam & effectum Statutorum in ea parte editorum & provisorum*; According to the form and effect of the Statutes in that case made and provided: but the Statutes allow no lesse number then four, or at the least three to ordein, At the *Nagges* head (you say there was but one

Ordeiner. Our Statutes prescribe *Imposition of Hands* as the Essentiall matter of Ordination, and these words, *Receive the Holy Ghost* as the form of Ordination : but your *Nagges head* Ordination is a mere Phantasm, without matter or Forme ; our Statutes allow no such fanaticall and Phantasticall Formes, as your Form of the *Nagges head*. And so your Consequence, [*Consequently that of the Naggeshead might passe*], is foundered of all four, and can neither passe nor repasse, unlesse you can rase these words [*by viriue of the Queens Letters Patents*] out of the Statute, and insert these [*without the Queens Letters Patents*] : and likewise rase these words out of the Commission [*according to the Form and effect of the Statutes*], and insert these [*contrary to the Form and effect of the Statutes*]. A single Falsification will doe your cause no good. Two poisons may perchance help it at a dead lift.

It is in vain to tell us, that Mr *Mason* see this over clear to be denied, who know better that Mr. *Mason* did not onely deny it over and over again, but squeezed the poore Fable to durt. I have shewed you particularly what was the end of the *Queens Dispensations*,
the

the same which is the end of Papall Dispensations, to meet with latent objections or cavills. I have shewed you what that Cavill was; which needed no Dispensation in point of Law, but onely to stop the mouths of Gainsaiers. But where you adde, that the *Queens Dispensation* was given, not in conditionall but in very absolute Termes: You are absolutely mistaken. The *Queens dispensation* was both in Generall Termes, which determin nothing, (not like the Popes Dispensations, *A quibusvis excommunicationis suspensionis & interdicti sententiis*): and also in these conditionall Terms, *si quid &c. desit aut deerit eorum quae per Statuta hujus regni nostri, aut per leges Ecclesiasticas in hac parte requiruntur*: If any thing is or shall be wanting, which are required by the Lawes Civill or Ecclesiasticall of this Kingdome. You see it is conditionall and hath reference onely to the Lawes of England.

They goe on, the truth is, all the world laughed at the Nagges head Consecration, and held it to be invalid, not so much for being performed in a Tavern, as for the new form invented by Scory.

(150)

If all the world did laugh at it in those dayes, they laughed in their sleeves, where no body could see them laugh. It had been too much to laugh at a jeast before it was made, nay before it was devised. The Reader may well wonder, how *all the world* came to get notice of it so early as the beginning of *Queen Elizabeths* reign, and we onely in *England* should heare nothing of it for above 40 yeares after? But assoone as we did heare of it, we laught at it as well as they, and held it as invalid as they could doe for their hearts; but they laught at it as Bishop *Scoryes* Invention, and we laught at it as theirs.

C A P. VII.

Of Bishop Bonner, the Reoordination of our Clergy, the quality of their witnesses, Mr. Fitzherberts suspicions, the testimony of their Doctors, and the Publishing of our Register before Mr. Mason

Their next instance is in Bishop *Bonnors* case, who was indicted by *Mr. Horn*, one of
of

of the First Protestant Bishops consecrated by Mr. Parker, or together with him, for refusing to take the Oath of Supremacy. The first error might be pardoned, as being onely a mistake in a word, to say that Bishop Bonner was indicted by Mr. Horn, where as he was onely signified by Bishop Horn; but the second mistake is fatall, that after all this confidence, and this great Notoreity of the Naggeshead Ordination to all the world, these Fathers themselves are still uncertain, whether Bishop Horn were consecrated by Archbishop Parker, or at the same time with him; that is as much as to say, they know not certainly what was done at the Naggeshead, but they wish that if the Confirmation dinner were not a Consecration, it had been one. It could never end better, for Mr. Neale to feign an Ordination, without an Actuary to record what was done. Bishop Walson and Mr. Bluet and the rest were much to blame, that (since he had the fortune to weare Gyges his ring and walk invisible) they did not cause him to play the publick Notary himself, and draw that which was done there into Acts; then we might have known as certainly as he could tell us, whether Dr. Parker had been consecrated there by his

Proctor Dr *Bullsingham*. It may be, some very credulous Reader, who like the old *Lamia*, could take out his eyes and put them in again when he pleased, would have given more credit to Mr *Neales* pleasant Fable, then to the publick Rolles and Registers of the Kingdome.

I have handled Bishop *Bonnors* case before: and these Fathers themselves have unwittingly given sentence in it against him; That King Edwards *Forme of Ordination*, was reestablished by Act of Parliamant in the first yeare of Queen Elisabeth. But finall sentence there was never any given, untill the Parliament gave a finall sentence in it, That Bishop *Horn* and all the rest were legall Bishops. To admit a Plea to be tryed by a Iury, and the veredict of the Iury, are two very distinct things.

They tell us, he was a man specially shot at. Rather he was a man graciously preserved by the Queens mercy, from the rage of the Common people against him. If they had shot at him, they could have found waies enough to have rendered the Oath of Supremacy to him, without Bishop

shop *Horn*. I professe I am no great Patron of such Oaths, men have more dominion over their actions then over their judgements: Yet there is lesse to be said for Bishop *Bonner*, then for other men. He who had so great a hand in framing the Oath, He who had taken it himself, both in King *Henryes* time, and King *Edwards* time, and made so many others to take it, He who had been so great a stickler in *Rome* for the Kings Supremacy, who writ that Preface before Bishop *Gardiners* booke *de vera Obedientia*: if he had suffered by the Oath of Supremacy, he had but been scourged with a rod of his own making.

Their next reason to prove the Nullity of our Holy Orders, is taken from *the constant Practice of the Romane Catholicks*, to Reordein Protestant Ministers, not conditionally but absolutely, which they call an evident Argument of our mere Laity. A doughty Argument indeed, drawn from their own
 Autho-

Authority. Can any man doubt, that that they which make no scruple of taking away our lives, will make conscience of taking away our Orders? This is that which we accuse them of, and they doe fairly begge the Question. If Reordination be Sacrilege (as they say it is), we are ready to convince them of grosse Sacrilege, or iterating all the Essentialls of Ordination, the same matter and the same Form that is for Episcopacy, the same Imposition of Hands by three Bishops, and the same words *Receive the Holy Ghost &c.* Some were of the same mind with these Fathets in *Queen Maries* time: but *Paul* the 4. and *Cardinall Poole* were wiser, who confirmed all Ordinations in *Edward* the sixths time indifferently, so the Persons professed but their Conformity to the Roman Religion. How doth this consist with your pretended Nullity?

They say, *Our Records were produced by Mr. Mason in the yeares 1613, fifty yeares after they ought to have been shewed.* They forget that they were published in Print in Arch Bishop *Parkers* lifetime, that they were justified by the Parliament 8. *Elisabetha*, that all of them goe hand in hand with our Civill Records,

He saith, *it cannot be testified by any law-
full witnesses (produced by us) that they were
not forged.* This is their Method, first to
accuse us of Forgery, and then to put us
to prove a Negative; where learnt he this
Form of proceeding? By all Lawes of
God and man the Accuser is to make good
his Accusation: yet we have given him
witnesses beyond exception. They say,
*there can not be a more evident mark of For-
gery, then the concealment of Registers, if they
be usefull and necessary to the persons in whose
Custody they are.* The prooffe lieth on the
other hand. Tell us how they were con-
cealed, which were published to the world
in Print, by a whole Parliament, by pri-
vate persons, and were evermore left in a
Publick Office, where all the world might
view them from time to time, who had ei-
ther occasion or desire to doe it? That our
Adversaries did *insult and Triumph over us,*
is but an empty flourish without truth or
reality, as we shall see presently.

They say, *it is not worth refusing which some
modern Protestants say, ye have no witnesses of
the story of the Nagges head &c. but Roman
Catholicks, we value not their Testimony, be-
cause they are known Adversaries.* This
answer they term *Ridiculous*, and paralell
it

it with the answer of an Officer in *Ireland*. You will not find this answer so ridiculous, upon more serious consideration. Protestants know that some Exceptions in Law, do destroy all Credit, and some other Exceptions do onely diminish credit. An Adversaries Testimony may be admitted in some cases, but it is subject to exception and makes no full prooffe, especially in cases favourable in the Law; as the case of persons spoiled, (which is your Irish case), such witnesses may be admitted, *ante omnia spoliatus restitui debet*; but then they ought to make up in number what they want in weight.

But you mistake wholly, our answer is not, that you produce no witnesses for the story of the Nagges head but Roman Catholicks: Our answer is that you produce no witnesses at all, neither Roman Catholicks nor others. For first one witness is no witness in Law, Let him be beyond exception duely sworn and examined, yet his Testimony makes but *semiplenam probationem*, half a prooffe; especially in Criminall causes such as this is, it is no thing. One witness shall not rise up against a
man

(157)

man for any Iniquity or any sinne, At the mouth of two witnesses or at the mouth of three witnesses shall the matter be established. Which law is confirmed by our Saviour. They were never yet able to pretend any eye witness by name, but Mr. Neale, or some body that had no name, because he had no being in the nature of things: all the rest had it from Mr. Neales single Testimony, because they cannot testify what was done, but what Mr. Neale said.

Mat.
18.16.

Secondly, Mr. Neale testifieth nothing, as a single witness ought to testify. He was never sworn to speake the truth, he never testified it before a publick Notary, he was never examined before a competent Iudge, he was never produced before the face of a Protestant. Is this the manner of the Romans now a daies, to condemne whole Churches upon the verbal Testimony of a single witness, before he be brought face to face with those whom he accuseth; and such a Testimony which is clogged with so many improbabilities and incongruities, and incoherences, that no rationally impartiall man can trust one syllable of it? whereas

whereas in such a case as this, against the third Estate of the Kingdome, against the Records Civill and Ecclesiasticall, against the testimony of a Parliament, an hundred witnesses ought not to be admitted.

We regard not Mr. Fitzherberts *suspicious* at all. What are the suspicions of a private stranger, to the well known credit of a publick Register? His *suspicious* can weigh no more then his reasons, that is just nothing. He saith *this exception is no new quarrell, but vehemently urged to the English Clergy in the beginning of the Queens reign, to shew how and by whom they were made Priests Bishops &c.* You have said enough to confute yourselves, but you touch not us. If they had known that they were consecrated at the *Nagges head*, as well as you would seem to know it, they needed not to urge it so vehemently to shew how and by whom they were ordeined; they would have done that for them readily enough; unlesse perhaps you thinke that they concealed the *Nagges head* Ordination out of favour to the Protestants. But I see you are mistaken in this as in all other things. There was an old objection indeed, that our Consecraters were not Roman Catholiks, and that our Consecration was not *Ritu Ro.*

Romano, or that we were not Ordeined by Papall Authority; but the *Nagges head* Ordination is a new question. What might be whispered underhand, in the eares of credulous persons of your own party in Corners, we do not know: but for all your contrary intimations, none of all your Writers did dare to put any such thing in print, for above fourty yeares after Arch Bishop *Parkers* Consecration. If *silent Wunesses in such circumstances prove more then others*, as you affirm, then all your writers are our witnesses. But none of all your Doctors did ever urge any such thing, as required that we should cite the Registers in prudence, as by a cleare answer to all your Testimonies shall appeare. The water did not stop there in those dayes: yet even in Arch Bishop *Parkers* life time the Consecration of our Bishops was published to the world in Print; either shew us as much for your *Nagges head* Ordination, or hold your peace for ever. Bishop *Andrews* the learned Bishop of *Winchesters* *absurdities falsities and lies*, are easily talked of, men may talke of black Swans: but he who hath laid your greatest Champions in the dust, requires another manner of Discoverer then Mr. *Fitzherbert*.

But

But these Fathers are resolved to confute themselves, without the help of an Adversary. They tell us, that *no mention was ever made of Registers testifying Parkers Consecration at Lambeth, untill Mr. Mason printed his booke.* This is not true, they were mentioned by the Parliament, mentioned in Print, I think before Mr. *Mason* was born. What though *Lambeth* were not mentioned, if the Legality of his Consecration were mentioned? This is enough to answer your Objection; this is enough to confute your Romance of the *Nagges head*. Yet thus much you yourselves confesse in the same Paragraph, that in a booke printed in the year 1605 (that is eight yeares before the year 1613, wherein you say that Mr. *Mason* printed his booke) called *Antiquitates Britannia*, there is a Register of the Protestant Bishops of England: Thē there was a Register of the Consecration of Protestant Bishops extant, before Mr. *Mason* did write of that subject. You say, *that Register doth not mention any certain place or Form of their Consecration.* It was not needfull; the Law prescribeth the Form, and the place was indifferent, so it were a consecrated place, which the Law doth likewise prescribe. But you tell us further, that *this*
 Re-

gister was forged or foisted in, and that your learned but namelesse Friend, see the old Manuscript of that booke, wherein there is no mention of any such Register, which you tell us in your Friends words, that *all the world may see how this Register was forged.* Why are all the world bound to believe your Friend? How should we give credit to a man who tells us three notorious untruths in foure lines? First, that it is pretended that *Archbishop Parker was made a Bishop by Barlow Scory and three others,* by virtue of a Commission from *Queen Elisabeth*: he was made a Bishop by Barlow Scory and two others. Secondly, that this work was acted on the 17. day of September, An: 1559, which was acted on the 17. Day of December 1559. Thirdly, that we had no form then or Order to doe such a busi-
 nesse; whereas you yourselves confesse, that *Edward the sixths rne of Ordination, was reestablished in the First yeare of Queen Elisabeth*: and Archbishop Parkers Ordination was in the second of *Queen Elisabeth*. He who stumbles so thick and three fold, may erre in his viewing the Manuscript as well as the rest. But to gratify you, suppose it was foisted in, what good will that doe you? It must of necessity be foisted in before it was printed, it could not be foisted

pa. 10.

in after it was printed, And it must be foisted in by a Protestant, for no Roman Catholick would foist it in. So still you see a Register of Protestant Bishops, was published to the world in print, evght yeares before *Mr. Mason* published his booke.

Your Friend saith, that *this printed Booke of Parkers Antiquitates Britannix, is the first that mentioneth any such pretended Consecration of him and the rest.* So it might be well when it was first printed, that was not in the yeare 1605, but in Arch-Bishop *Parkers* life time, three yeares before his death, An. 1570. So much you might have learned from the very Title-page of the Booke, printed at *Hannovv*; *Historia antehac non nisi semel, nimirum Londini in Aedibus Iohannis Day anno 1572. excusa: That this History vvas printed formerly at London in the house of Iohn Day in the yeare 1572.* This doth utterly destroy the Credit of your Friends Relation, that he had viewed the Manuscript of that Booke. There needed no Manuscript, where they had a Printed booke for their Copy, (as the Title-page telleth us they had) : and that printed above sixty yeares before your Friend writ, it is probable before his Birth. If there be any thing of foisting

sting in the case, there is rather something foisted out of the former Edition, then foisted in; namely, Archbishop Parkers Life untill that time, with the particular Consecrations of our first Bishops, which were in the *London* Edition, and are omitted in this Edition of *Hannow*. This is cleare enough by the very Title, *An History of 70. Archbishops*, and there are in this Edition but 69. Archbishops, because the Life of Archbishop Parker is wanting; which nevertheless is promised in the Life of Archbishop Warham pag. 312. [*ut in Matthai Parker Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi vita inferius dicemus: As we shall say hereafter in the Life of Mathew Parker Archbishop of Canterbury.* You see how infortunate you are in accusing others of Forgery.

Your Authour proceedeth, *Any man reading the printed Booke, will manifestly see it is a meerly foisted and inserted thing, having no connexion correspondence or affinity, either vvith that which goeth before, or followeth it.* Say you so? There was never any thing more firly inserted. The Author undertaketh to write the Lives of 70. succeeding Archbishops of Canterbury, from *Austin*

to *Matthew Parker*, and having premit-
 ted some generall Observations conce-
 ning the Antiquity of Christian Religion
 in *Britany*, with the names of some Arch-
 Bishops of *London*, and the Originall and
 Changes of Episcopall Sees in *England*, and
 some other Generalities concerning the
 Privileges of the See of *Canterbury*, and
 the Conversion of *Kent*; Iust before he en-
 ter upon the Life of *St. Austin* the first
 Archbishop, he presenteth the Reader
 with a summary View of the Archbishop-
 rick of *Canterbury*, at that time when the
 booke was first printed, in the yeare 1572,
 with the names of all the Bishops of the
 Province at that time, their Countries,
 their Armes, both of their Sees and of
 their Families, their respective Ages, their
 Vniversities, their Degrees in Schooles,
 with the times of their severall Consecra-
 tions, if they were ordeined Bishops, or
 Confirmations, if they were translated
 from another See. It is hardly possible
 for the wit of man to contriue more
 matter into a lesser Roome. Then, he
 settes downe a like Table for the Pro-
 vince of *Yorke*: and lastly an Alphabeti-
 call Catalogue of the Bishops whose Lives
 were described in this booke, and a—
 mong

mong the rest, Archbishop Parker, whose Life (if you call it *foisting*) is foisted out of this *Hannow* Edition. If this hath no connexion or affinity with that which goeth before, and followeth after, I know not what Connexion or Affinity is.

Your Friends last Exception against the Authority of that booke called *Antiquitates Britannia*, is, that it containeth more things done after *Matthew Parker* had written that Booke. So you confesse that Archbishop Parker himself (about whom all our controversy is,) was the Author of that booke; wherein I agree with you. The conclusion of the Preface, and many other reasons invite me to doe so. Surely this Author meant that there is something contained in this Register, which is not within the Compasse of the following Lives in the *Hannow* Edition, (that may well be because *Matthew Parkers* life is foisted out in this Edition;) but there is nothing which was not in the *London* Edition, much more largely then it is in this Register, especially for the Confirmations and Consecrations of our Protestant Bishops: there is nothing after the time when this Register was made, which is prefixed in the Frontispice of it in the *Hannow* Edition, with MP for *Matthew Parker*.

Matthew Parker died May the 27, *Anno* 1575; he printed his booke at *London* three yeares before his death, without the Authours name, in the yeare 1572. I appeale to the ingenuous Reader, (let him be of what Communion he will, or never so full of prejudice), whether it be credible, that Arch Bishop *Parkers* own booke should be printed in *London*, by the *Queens* Printer, in his life time, and have any thing foisted into it contrary to his sense.

Here then we have a Register of Protestant Bishops, with their Confirmations and Consecrations, published to the world in Print at *London*, by Arch Bishop *Parker* himself, (who was the principall person and most concerned in that Controversy,) as if it should dare all the Adversaries of our Church to except against it, if they could. Registers cannot be concealed, being alwaies kept in the most publick and conspicuous places of great Cities, whither every one hath access to them who will. They need no printing, but this was printed (a work of supererogation). They who dared not to except against it then, when it was fresh in all mens memories, ought not to be admitted to make conjecturall exceptions now.

Now the Fathers come to shew, how
their

their Doctors did object to our Protestant Clergy, *the Nullity and Illegality of their Ordination.* If their Doctors give a cause or reason of their knowledge, we are bound to answer that: but if they object nothing but their own Iudgement and authority, we regard it not; their judgement may weigh some thing with them, but nothing at all with us. This is not to make themselves Advocates, but Iudges over us, which we do not allow. If I should produce the Testimonies of fourscore Protestant Doctors, who affirm that we have a good Succession, or that their Succession is not good, what would they value it?

The first is Doctor Bristow; Consider what Church that is, whose Ministers are but very Laymen, unsent, uncalled, unconsecrated, holding therefore amongst us when they repent and return, no other place but of Laymen, in no case admitted, no nor looking to Minister in any Office, unlesse they take Orders which before they had not. Here is Doctor Bristows Determination, but where are his grounds? He bringeth none at all, but the practise of the Roman Church, and that not generall. Paul the 4, and Cardinall Poole, and the Court of Rome in those dayes were of another Iudgement, and so are many others: and so may they themselves come to be,

when they have considered more seriously of the matter, that we have both the same old Essentials. That which excuseth their Reordination from formall Sacrilege (for from materiall it cannot be excused upon their own grounds,) is this, that they cannot discover the truth of the matter of Fact, for the hideous Fables raised by our Countrymen. But where is the *Nagges head* Ordination in *Dr. Bristow*? Then had been the time to have objected it, and printed it, if there had bee any reality in it. Either *Dr. Bristow* had never heard of this *ryPageant*, or he was ashamed of it. Here we meet with *Dr. Fulke* again, and what they say of him shall be answered in its proper place

Their next witness is *Mr. Reinolds*, *There is no Heardman in all Turkey, who doib not undertake the Government of his Heard, upon better reason and greater right Order and authority, then these your magnificent Apostles. &c.* And why an *Heardsman* in Turkey, but onely to allude to his Title of *Calvino Turcismus*? An *heardsman* in Turkey hath as much right to order his heard, as an *he-ardman* in Christendome; unlesse perhaps your *Dr.* did think, that *Dominiõ* was founded in Grace, not in nature. This is saying, but we expect proving. It is well known that you pretend more to a magnificent Apo-
stola.

folate, them we. If the authority of the holy Scripture (which knoweth no other Essentials of Ordination; but *imposition of hands* and these words *Receive the Holy Ghost*;) if the perpetual practise of the universall church, if the Prescription of the ancient Councell of *Carthage*, and above 200. Orthodox Bishops, with the *concurrent* approbation of the Primitive Fathers be sufficient grounds, we want not sufficient grounds for the exercise of our Sacred Functions. But on the contrary, there is no *Heardman in Turkey* who hath not more sufficient grounds or assurance of the lawfulness of his Office, then you have for the discharge of your Holy Orders, upon your own grounds. The Turkish Heardman receives his Masters Commands without examining his intention: but according to your grounds, if in an hundred successive Ordinations, there were but one Bishop who had an intention not to Ordein, or no intention to ordein, or but one Priest who had an intention not to baptise, or no intention to baptise any of these Bishops, then your whole Succession cometh to nothing. But I must aske still where is your *Nagges head* Ordination in all this? Mr. *Reinolds* might have made a pleasant Parallel between the *Nagges head* Ordination and the Ordination of the Turkish *Mufsi*,
and

and wanted not a mind mischievous enough against his Mother the Church of England, if he could have found the least pretext: but there was none. You seek for water out of a Pumice.

Their third Witnesse is Dr. Stapleton, in his Counterblast against Bishop Horn. *To say truly, you are no Lord Winchester, nor elsuwhere, but onely Mr Robert Horn. Is it not notorious that you and your Collegues were not ordeined according to the prescript, I will not say of the Church, but even of the very Statutes? How then can you challenge to your self the name of the Lord Bishop of Winchester? You are without any Consecration at all of your Metropolitan, himself pooreman being no Bishop neither.* This was a loud blast indeed: but if Dr Stapleton could have said any thing of the *Nagges head* Ordination, he would have given another manner of blast, that should have made the whole world Echo again with the Sound of it. In vain you seek any thing of the *Nagges head* in your writers, untill after the yeare 1600. For answer, Dr. Stapleton raiseth no Objection from the Institution of Christ, whereupon and onely

onely whereupon, the Validity or Invalidity of Ordination doth depend: but onely from the Lawes of *England*. First for the Canons, we maintein that our Form of Episcopall Ordination hath the same Essentialls with the Roman: but in other things of an inferiour allay it differeth from it. The Papall Canons were never admitted for binding Lawes in *England*, further then they were received by our selves, and incorporated into our Lawes: but our Ordination is conformable to the Canons of the Catholick Church, which prescribe no new Matter and Form in Priestly Ordination. And for our Statutes, the Parliament hath answered that Objection sufficiently, shewing clearly, that the Ordination of our first Protestant Bishops was legall, and for the Validity of it, we crave no mans favour.

Their last witnesse is *Dr. Harding*, who had as good a will (if there had been any reality in it) to have spoken of the *Nagges head* Ordination as the best, but he speaketh not a Syllable of it more then the rest: and though they keep a great stirre with him, he bringeth nothing that is worth the weighing. First he readeth us a profound Lecture, that *Sacerdos* Signifieth both a Priest and a Bishop. Let it signify so, and

and in *St. Hieroms* sense, what will he inferre from thence ? Next , he askes Bishop Iewell of *Bishoply and Priestly vocation and sending*. What new canting language is this? Could he not as well have made use of the old Ecclesiasticall word of *Ordination*? I hirdly he taxeth the Bishop , that *he answereth not by what example hands were laid on him , or who sent him*. What doth this concern any question between them and us ? Hands were laid on him by the example of Christ , of his Apostles , of the Primitive and Modern Church: so Christ set him, the King set him, the Church sent him, in severall respects. He telleth us , that when he had *duely considered* his Protestant Ordination in King Edwards time , *he did not take himself for lawfull deacon in all respects*. If his Protestant Ordination were a Nullity (as these mē say), thē he was a lawfull Deacon in no respect. Pope Paul the 4. and Cardinall Poole were of another mind. Then follow his two grand excepti-
 ons against our Ordination , wherein you shal find nothing of your *Nagges head fable*. The former exceptiō is, that King Edwards Bishops *who gave Orders, were out of Orders themselves*. The second is, that *they ministred not orders according to the Rite ad manner of the Catholick Church*. For the former exception, I referre him to the Councell of Carthage in
 St.

St. *Austins* time, and for both his excepitions to Cardinall *Poles* Confirmation of King *Edwards* Bishops and Priests, and *Paul* the 4. Ratification of his Act. If any man have a mind to inquire further into the Validity of our Form of Ordination, let him leave these Fables and take his scope freely

To all this they say, that *Bishop Jewell* answers with profound silence, yet they adde, onely he sayes without any prooffe, that their Bishops are made by Form and Order, and by the Consecration of the Arch bishop and other three Bishops, and by admission of the Prince. I expected profound silence, but I find a profound answer; this is the first time I learned how a man can both keep profound silence and answer so pertinently all at once. How doth Dr. *Harding* goe about to take away this answer: For *Bishop Jewell* was the defendant, and the burthen of the prooffe did not rest upon him? First I pray you how was your Archbishop consecrated? If Dr. *Harding* did not see his Consecration, he might have seen it if he would. He askes further, what three Bishops were there in the Realm to lay hands upon him? Ask the Queens Letters patents, and they will shew you seven. What a weake Socraticall kind of arguing is this, altogether by questions, without any Inference? If Dr. *Harding* could have said it justly

justly, (and he could have said it if it had been so), he should have confuted him boldly, and told him your Metropolitan was consecrated in the *Nagges head*, by one single Bishop, in a fanaticall and phantastick manner : but he did not, he durst not do it, because he knew it to be otherwise, and it was publickly known to be otherwise. All his exception is against our Form, *If you had been Consecrated after the Form and Order which hath ever been used, you might have had Bishops out of France or at home in England.* It is the Forme established in King *Edwards* time, and restored in Queen *Elisabelhs* time, which Doctr. *Harding* impugneth, not that ridiculous Form which they Father upon Bishop *Scory*: and their cheife objection against that Form, was that vain Cavill, that it was not restored by Act of Parliament, which since hath been answered abundantly by an Act of Parliament. Hereupon he telleth Bishop *Jewell*, that *his Metropolitan had no lawfull Consecration.* Though his Consecration had not been lawfull, yet it might have been valid, but it was both legall and valid. This is all that Doctor *Harding* hath, which a much meaner Scholler

Schollar then that learned Prelate might have adventured upon, without feare of burning his Fingers.

Their next prooffe against our Records, is taken from the Contradictions of our Writers, Mr. Mafons *Registers and Records*, disagree with those that Mr. Goodwin used in his *Catalogue of Bishops*, sometimes in the Day sometimes in the moneth, sometimes in the year. And againe, Mr. Mason Sutcliffe and Mr. Butler, all speaking of Mr. Parkers Consecration, doe all differ one from another in naming his Consecraters; Mr. Mason saith it was done by Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgskins. Mr. Sutcliffe saith, besides the three first there was two Suffragans. M Butler saith, the Suffragan of Dover was one, who is not named in the Commission. So as these men seem to have had three Disagreeing Registers. I answer, first that it is scarcely possible to avoid errours in transcribing and printing of Bookes, in the Authors absence, especially in names and numbers. To keep a balling and a stirre about these Errata of the pen or of the presse, is like the barking of little Curses, which

which trouble the whole Vicinage about the Mooneshining in the Water. Such were the most of these.

Secondly supposing that some very few of these were the real mistakes of the Authors, yet innocent mistakes, which have no plot in them or design of Interest or Advantage, which conduce neither *pro* nor *contra* to any Controversy that is on Foot, they ought not to be exaggerated or pressed severely; It is the Wisdome of a wise man to passe by an Infirmary. Such are all these petty Differences. Whether Archbishop *Parker* was consecrated by three City Bishops and two Suffragan, or by three City Bishops and one Suffragan Bishop, and whether this one Suffragan were Suffragan of *Bedford* or Suffragan of *Dover*, conduceth nothing to any Controversy which is on Foot in the Church, and signifieth nothing to the Validity or invalidity, legality or illegality, canonicalness or uncanonicalness of his Ordination. All Memories are not so happy, to remember names and numbers, after a long distance of time, especially if they entered but by the ear, and were not *Oculis subjecta fidelibus*. If any man should put me to depose (wanting my notes and memorialls,) what Priests did

did impose hands upon me with Arch-
 bishop *Mathews* at my Priestly Ordination,
 or what Bishops did joine with my Lord
 Primate of *Ireland* at my Episcopall Ordi-
 nation, I could not doe it exactly. I
 know there were more then the Canons
 doe require, at either Ordination; and re-
 ferre my self to the Register. Whether two
 Suffragans or one Suffragan, is an easy mi-
 stake, when there were two in the Com-
 mission, and but one at the Consecration:
 so is the Suffragan of *Dover* for the Suffra-
 gan of *Bedford*.

Thirdly, whether these were the faults
 of the pen or the presse or the Authour;
 yet after retraction it ought not to be ob-
 jected. It is inhumane to charge any man
 with that fault, which he himself had cor-
 rected and amended. Bishop *Goodwin* cor-
 rected all these errours himself, with-
 out any Monitor, and published his Cor-
 rection of his errours to the world in
 Print long since, in a new Edition of his
 booke. Likewise Dr. *Sutcliffe* acknow-
 ledged his mistake and gave order to
Mr. Mason to publish it to the world, as
 he did.

To ground exceptions upon the errours
 of the presse, or the slips of the tongue or
 M pen

pen or of the memory, after they have been publicly amended, is like flies to delight in sores, and neglect the body when it is sound. I have the same error crept into a booke of mine, of [five] for [four], how it came I know not, for the booke was printed in my absence: but I have corrected it in mine own Copy and in many Copies of my Friends, where I meet with the booke.

Lastly, there is no danger in such petty differences, so long as all parties doe submit themselves to the publick Registers of the Church, as all these writers doe; although it may be some of them were better acquainted with Polemick Writers, then with Registers, or the practicall customes of the Church of *England*. The very Reference or submission of themselves to the Register, is an Implicit retractation of their errors. As in a City the Clocks may differ, and the peoples Iudgements of the time of the day, but both Clocks and Clerkes must submit to the Sun dyall when the sun shineth out: so all private memorialls must be, and are submitted to the publick Register of the Church. Where these Fathers talk of plurality of Registers, they erre because they understand not our Customes, Every Bishop

shop throughout the Kingdome hath one Registry at least, every Dean and Chapter hath a Registry. The ordinations of Priests and Deacons, and the Institution of Clerkes to Benefices, are recorded in the Registries of the Respective Bishops, in whose diocesses they are ordeined and instituted. The elections of Bishops and Inthronisations and Installations, in the Registry of the respective Deans and Chapters; and the Confirmations and Consecrations of Bishops, in the Registry of the Archbishop where they are consecrated; except the Archbishop be pleased to grant a Commission to some other Bishops, to Consecrate the elected and confirmed Bishop in some other place. But the same thing can not be recorded originally but in one Registry.

CAP. VIII.

Dr. Whitaker and Dr. Fulke defended, Bishop Barlowes Consecration justified, of Iohn Stowes Testimony, and the Earle of Notinghams &c.

Here the Fathers take upon them the Office of Iudges or Censors rather than of Advocates. *Mr. Mason ought to have answered as Mr. Whitaker and Mr. Fulke, (they were both eminent Drs. in the Schooles) who had reason to be better informed of the Records then he.* How? Nay nor half so well. They were both contemplative men, Cloistered up in *St. Iohns College*, better acquainted with Polemick writers, then with Records, They were both ordeined Deacons and Priests legally, Canonically, according to the Form prescribed by the Church of England: and were no such ill Birds to defile their own nests. If the Records of their Ordination will satisfy you, that they were no Enthusiasts, (as you imagin,) you may quickly receive satisfaction: But if they had said any thing contrary to our Lawes and Canons, you must
not

not thinke to wrangle the Church of England out of a good possession, by private voluntary speculations. Let us see what these Doctrs say as you allege them, for I have not their bookes in present. Mr. *Whitaker* saith, *I would not have you thinke we make such reckoning of your Orders, as to hold our own Vocation unlawfull without them.* You see Doctor *Whitaker* justifieth our Ordination in this very place as lawfull, and much more plainly elsewhere in his writings. That though our Bishops and Ministers be not Ordained by Papisticall Bishops, yet they are orderly and lawfully ordeined: Again, The Romanists account none lawfull Pastors, but such as are created according to their Form or Order. These are your two main Objections against our Ordination, that we are not ordeined by Bishops of your Communion. That we are not ordeined according to the Roman Form. In both of these Doctor *Whitaker* is wholly for us against you, that which he maketh no reckoning of, is your Form of Ordination, as it is contradistinct from ours, as it is in many things, especially in your double matter and Form in Priestly Ordination.

You say Mr. *Fulke* speakes more plainly Let us heare him. *You are highly deceived*

*if you thinke we esteeme your Offices of Bishops
 Priests and Deacons better then Laymen: and
 with all our heart we desie, abhorre, detest, and
 spit at your stinking, greasy, Antichristian Or-
 ders. This is high enough indeed, and
 might have been expresse in more mode-
 rate termes: but it is to be expounded, not
 of the invalidity of your Ordination, as if
 it wanted any Essentiall, but partly in re-
 spect of the not using or abusing these sa-
 cred Offices, and partly in respect of the
 Lawes of England. Excesses may make
 an Ordination unlawfull, although they do
 not make it invalid. Holy Orders are an
 excellent Grace conferred by God for the
 Conversion of men: but if those who have
 them, instead of preaching truth do teach
 errours to his people, and adulterate the
 old Christian Faith by addition of new
 Articles, they are no longer true Pastors,
 but Wolves which destroy the Flock, and
 so they are not onely no better, but worse
 then Lay men, *Corruptio optimi pessima*. In
 this respect they tell you, that your Priests
 and Bishops are no true Priests and Bi-
 shops, as *Marcellus* told his Soldiers that
 they were no true Romans (who were
 naturall Romans) because they wanted
 the old Roman virtue. Lastly you have
 has*

habitual power to exercise these Offices, but you want actual power in *England*, by reason of the not application, or rather the subtraction of the matter by our *Lawes*: so you are no legall Bishops or Priests there. This I take to have been the sense of these two Doctors.

Now are we come to their grand exception, against Bishop *Barlow*, who was one of the Consecraters of Archbishop *Parker*, whose Consecration is not found in the Archbishops Register, and therefore they conclude that he was never consecrated. If this objection were true, yet it doth not render Archbishop *Parkers* Consecration either invalid or uncanonicall, because there were three other Bishops who joined in that Consecration besides Bishop *Barlow*, which is the full number required by the Canons. But this objection is most false, Bishop *Barlow* was a Consecrated Bishop above 20 yeares before the Consecration of Archbishop *Parker*. They should have done well to have proposed this doubt in Bishop *Barlows* lifetime, and then they might have had the Testimony of his Consecraters under an Archiepiscopall or Episco.

Episcopall Seale , for their satisfaction, The Testimony of the Archi-Episcopall Register , is a full prooffe of Consecration affirmatively , but it is not a full prooffe negatively ; such a Bishops Consecration is not recorded in this Register, therefore he was not Consecrated. For first , the negligence of an Officer or some crosse accident might hinder the recording. Secondly Fire or Thieves or some such Casualty might destroy or purloin the Record. Thirdly though it be not recorded in this Register , it may be recorded in another, the Arch Bishop may , and Arch Bishop *Cranmer* usually did delegate or give Commission to three other Bishops for Consecration. And though the work be ordinarily performed at *Lambeth* , because of the place , where they may have three Bishops alwaies present without any further Charge : yet they are not obliged by any Law to Consecrate them there. And if there be a sufficient number of Bishops near the Cathedrall which is to be filled , or if the person who is to be Consecrated do desire it , they may be Consecrated either in that, or any of their own Churches. The Bishops of the Province of Yorke , by reason of the former convenience

nience are usually consecrated at *Lambeth*, yet I have known in my time Bishop *Sinewes* of *Carlile* consecrated at *Yorke* upon his own desire, by the Archbishop of *Yorke*, and the Bishops of *Durham*, *Chester*, and *Mā*. A man might seek long enough for his Consecration in the Archbishop of *Canterburies Register* and misse it, but it is to be found in the Register at *Yorke*. So the Omission of it in that Register though it be no full prooffe, yet it is a probable prooffe that Bishop *Barlow* was not Consecrated there, but it is no prooffe at all that he was not Consecrated elsewhere.

And this I take to have been the case both of Bishop *Barlow* and Bishop *Gardiner*: and although the effluxion of above an hundred yeares since, hath rendered it more difficult to find where it was done, yet by the help of those Records which are in the Court of Faculties, I should not despaire of finding it yet.

But there are so many evident proofes that he was Consecrated, that no ingenuous person can have the Face to deny it. The first reason is, his actuall possession of 4. Bishopricks one after another, *St. Asaph*, *St. Davids*, *Bath and Wells* and *Chichester*, in the Reigns of three Princes. They feign some pretences why Archbishop *Parker* was

not consecrated Canonically, because there wanted a competent number of Bishops, though it were most false; but what can they feign why Bishop *Barlow* was not consecrated in *Henry* the eighths time? was *Henry* the eighth a Baby to be jeasted withall? In Archbishop *Parkers* case, they suppose all the Bishops to have been stark mad, to cast themselves down headlong from a Precipice, when they had a faire paire of Stairs to descend by: but in Bishop *Barlowes* case they suppose all the world to have been asleep; except there had been such an Vniversall sleep it had been impossible for any man in those dayes to creep into a Bishoprick in *England* without Consecration. To say he is actually possessed of a Bishoprick therefore he is Consecrated, is as clear a Demonstration in the English Law, as it is in nature to say the Sun shineth, therefore it is Day.

But it may be objected, that he held all these Bishopricks as a Commendatory, not in Title, as an Vsufuctuary not as a true owner. It is impossible, Vsufuctuaries are not elected and confirmed, but Bishop *Barlow* was both elected and Confirmed. The *Conge d'eslire* to the Dean and Chapter, the Letters Patents for his Confirmation, the Commission for the restitution of his Temporalties, do all prove that he was no
 Vfu-

Vsufu&uary but a right owner , This is a second reason.

Thirdly, The same Letters Patents that doe authorile Bishop *Barlowes* Confirmation , did likewise Command the Archbishop with the assistance of other Bishops to Consecrate him himself, or to give a Commissiō to other Bishops to Consecrate him, which if they did not perform within a prescribed time , or perform after another manner thē is prescribed by the Law, it was not onely a losse of their Bishopricks by the Law of *England*, but a Premunire or the losse of all their Estates, their Liberties, and a casting themselves out of the Kings Protectiō 25, Hen: 8. c. 20. No mē in their right wits would rnn such a hazard, or rather evidētly ruine thēselves and all their hopes without any need, without any ēd in the whole world. Fourthly, by the same Law no man could be acknowledged a Bishop in *England*, but he who was Consecrated legally, by three Bishops with the consent of the Metropolitan, but Bishop *Barlow* was acknowledged to be a true Bishop; The King received his Homage for his Bishoprick; the King commāded him to be restored to his Temporalties, which is never done untill the Consecratiō be passed. King *Henry* sent him into *Scotland* as his Ambassadour with the title of Bishop of

of *St. Davids*; and in his restitution to the Temporalties of that See, the King related that *the Arch Bishop had made him Bishop and Pastor of the Church of St. Davids*. This could not be if he had not been Consecrated.

Thirdly, he was admitted to sit in Parliament as a Consecrated Bishop; for no man can sit there as a Bishop before he be Consecrated, but it is plain by the Records of the house of the Lords that he did sit in Parliament many times in the 31 of *Henry the 8.* in his Episcopall habit, as a Consecrated Bishop; and being neither a Bishop of one of the five Principall Sees, nor a Privy Counsellor, he must sit and did sit according to the time of his Consecration, between the Bishops of *Chichester* and *St. Asaph*. What a strange boldness, is it to question his Consecration now, whom the whole Parliament, and his Consecrators among the rest, did admit without scruple then as a Consecrated Bishop.

Sixthly, There is no act more proper or essentiall to a Bishop then Ordination, *What doth a Bishop that a Priest doth not* (saith *St. Hierom*) *except Ordination?* But it is evident by the Records of his own See, that Bishop *Barlow* did Ordein Priests and
acons

Deacons frō time to time , and by the Arch Bishops Register that he, joined in Episcopall Ordination, and was one of those three Bishops who imposed hands upon Bishop Buckley Feb. 19. 1541.

Seventhly, there is nothing that trieth a Bishops Title to his Chuch more then the Validity and Invalidity of his Leases. If Bishop Barlow had been unconsecrated, all the Leases which he made in the Sec of St. Davids, and Bath and Wells, had been voide, and it had been the easiest thing in the whole world for his Successour in those dayes , to prove whether he was consecrated or not, but they never questioned his Leases, because they could not question his Consecration.

Lastly , an unconsecrated person hath neither Antecessors nor Successors , he succeedeth no man , no man succeedeth him. If a grant of any hereditaments be made to him and his Successours , it is absolutely void , not worth a deaf Nut ; If he alien any Lands belonging to his See from him and his Successours , it is absolutely void : But Bishop Barlow received the Priory of Brecknock from the Crown , to him and his Successors Bishops of St. Davids , and in King Edwards reign being Bishop of Bath
and

and *Wells* , he alienated from him and his Successours to the Crown much Land , and received back again from the Crown to him and his Successours equivalent Lands. If he had been unconsecrated all these Acts had been utterly void. In summe , whosoever dreameth now, that all the world were in a dead sleep then, for twenty yeares together , whilst all these things were acting , is much more asleep himself.

To these undeniable proofes I might adde as many more out of the Records of the Chancery , if there needed any to prove him a Consecrated Bishop. As.

A grant to the said *William Barlow* Bishop of *St. Davids* , to hold in Commendam with the said Bishoprick the Rectory of *Carewe* in the county of *Pembrooke* , Dated Octob. the 29, Anno 38. Hen. 8.

A commission for Translation of *William Barlow* Bishop of *St. Davids* to the Bishoprick of *Bath* and *Wells* , Dated. 3. Feb. 2. Edv. 6.

A Commission for the Consecration of *Robert Farrer* to be Bishop of *St. Davids* , per translationem *VVillelmi Barlow* &c, Dated 3. Iul, Anno 2. Edv. 6.

A Commission for the Restitution of the Temporalties of the said Bishoprick to the said Robert Farrer, as being void *per translationem Willelmi Barlow*. Dated 1. Augusti Anno 2. Edv. 6. In all which Records and many more he is alwaies named as a true Consecrated Bishop.

And lastly, in Bishop Goodwins booke *de Prasulibus Angliae* pa. 663. of the Latin Edition printed at London Anno 1616. in his Catalogue of the Bishops of St. Asaph num. 37. he hath these words. *Gulielmus Barlow Canonorum Regularium apud Bisham Prior Consecratus est. Feb. 22. Anno 1535; Aprili deinde sequente Meneviam translatus est. VVilliam Barlow Prior of the Canons Regulars at Bisham was consecrated the two and twentieth Day of February, in the yeare 1535, and in Aprill Following was translated to St. Davids.* Which confirmeth me in my former conjecture, that he was Consecrated in Wales, which Bishop Goodwin by reason of his Vicinity, had much more reason to know exactly then we have.

They

They say Mr. Mason *acknowledgeth* that Mr. Barlow was the man who consecrated Parker, because Hodgskins the Suffragan of Bedford was *onely* an Assistant in that action: and the Assistents in the Protestant Church *doe not consecrate*. By the Fathers leave, this is altogether untrue. Neither was Bishop Barlow the onely man who Consecrated Archbishop Parker; Neither was Bishop Hodgskins a meere Assistant in that action; Thirdly, who soever doe impose hands are joint consecraters, with us as well as them; Lastly, *Mr. Mason* saith no such thing as they affirm, but directly the Contrary, that all the foure Bishops were equally Consecraters, all imposed hands, all joined in the words, and this he proveth out of the Register it self, L. 3. c. 9. n. 8. & l. 3. c. 10. n. 9.

They object *He might as well be proved to have been a lawfull Husband, because he had a woman and diverse Children, as to have been a Consecrated Bishop because he ordeined. and Discharged all acts belonging to the Order of a Bishop.* What was Bishop Barlowes
 Woman

Woman pertinent to his cause. Are not Governants, and Devotesses, besides ordinary maidservants, women?

All which Pastours not onely of their own Communion, but of their own Society, are permitted to have in their houses. Let themselves be Iudges whether a Woman a wife, or a Woman a Governant or a Devotess, be more properly to be ranged under the name or notion of *συνεστακτῶν*, such women as were prohibited to Cohabit with Clerkes by the Councell of Nice. But to leave the *Hypothesis* and come to the *Thesis*, as being more pertinent to the present case. If a man have cohabited long with a Woman as man and wife in the Generall estimation of the world, and begot children upon her, and dies as her husband without any doubt or dispute during his life and long after, though all the Witnesses of their Marriage were dead, and the Register lost, this their Conjugall cohabitation and the common reputation of the world during his Life uncontroversied, is in Law a sufficient proove of the Marriage: but all the world *nemine contra-dicente* esteemed Bishop Barlow as the undoubted Bishop and Spouse of his Church.

N

They

They adde, *Ridley Hooper Farrer* were acknowledged and obeyed as Bishops in King Edwards time, yet were Iudged by both the Spirituall and Temporall Court not to have been consecrated. They mistake, they were not judged not to have been consecrated, (for their Consecrations are upon Record,) but not to have been consecrated *ritu Romano*, after the Roman Form. And who gave this Iudgement? Their open enemies, who made no scruple to take away their Lives, whose unjust judgement we doe not value a rush; but *Paul* the 4. and Cardinall *Pole*; more authentick Iudges of their own party, gave a later Iudgemēt to the Cōtrary.

They aske, how it is possible that *Barlowes* Cōsecration should not be found recorded (if ever it was), as well as his preferment to the Priory of *Bisham*, and Election and Confirmation to the Bishoprick of *St. Asaph*. I answer it is very easy to conceive. I have shewed him sundry wayes how it might be, and one probable way how it was. I desire the Reader to observe the extreme partiality of these Fathers, they make it impossible for the Acts of one Consecration to be lost or stollen, and yet accuse us of forging fifteen Consecrations. It is easier to steale fifteen, then to Forge one Act.

We have often asked a reason of them,
why

why the Protestants should decline their own Consecrations? They give us one, *The truth is, that Barlow as most of the Clergy in England in those times were Puritans, and inclined to Zuinglianisme, therefore they contemned and rejected Consecration as a rag of Rome, and were contented with the extraordinary calling of God and the Spirit, as all other Churches are, who pretend Reformation.* It is well they premised *the truth is*, otherwise there had not been one word of truth in what they say. First how do they know this? It must be either by Relation, but I am confident they can name no author for it: or by Revelation, but that they may not doe: or it is (to speake sparingly) their own Imagination. It is a great boldnesse, to take the liberty to cast aspersions upon the Clergy of a whole Nation. Secondly, how commeth Bishop *Barlow*, to be taxed of Puritanism? we meet him a Prior and a Bishop, we find him in his Robes, in his Rochet, in his Cope, Officiating, Ordaining, Confirming. He who made no scruple to Ordein and Consecrate others *gratis*, certainly did not forbear his own Consecration with the apparent hazard of the losse of his Bishoprick, out of scruple

ple of Conscience. Thirdly, this asper-
 sion is not well accommodated to the times,
 For first Zuinglianisme was but short hee-
 led in these Dayes when Bishop Barlow
 was Consecrated, who sat in Parliament
 as a Consecrated Bishop 31. Henr. 8:
 and the first Sermon that ever Zuinglius
 Preached as a Probationer, was in Zurick
 in the yeare 1510, that was in the 10. or 11.
 yeare of Hery the eighth. If there were any
 one Zuinglian in these dayes, upon their
 grounds, it is most likely to have been Bi-
 shop Gardiner, for his Consecration doth
 not appeare more then Bishop Barlowes.

But there is yet a greater mistake in it;
 it is the Anabaptists who reject Ordination,
*and content themselves with the extraordinary
 calling of the Spirit, not the Zuinglians.* In
 the writings of Zuinglius we find a Letter
 of him and ten other of the principall Hel-
 vetian Theologians, to the Bishop of
 Constance; beseeching him in all humility
 and observance, *to favour and help forward
 their beginnings, as an excellent work and wor-
 thy of a Bishop;* They implore his Clemency,
 Wisdome, learning, that he would be the first
 fruits of the German Bishops; They beseech
 him by the Common Christ, by that fatherly af-
 fection which he owes unto them, to looke graci-
 ously

ously upon them &c; They court him to shew himself a Father, and grant the request of his obedient sonnes. Zuinglius and the Zuinglians liked Bishops well enough, if he could have had them. But the Bishop of Constance of another Communion was their Bishop.

Here Meanderlike they make a winding from St. Asaph back again to Cheapside, from Bishop Barlowes Consecration to Archbishop Parkers. They say, that if there had been any other Consecration of Archbishop Parker then that of the Nagges head, John Stow would not conceale it in his Annales; who is so diligent in setting down all that passed in and about London, and professeth personall respect to him, he having related the Consecration of Cardinall Pole with so many particulars. They adde out of Dr. Champerney, that John Stow acknowledged to many persons that the story of the Nagges head was true. Their store is very low, when they are forced to produce John Stow, who scarce knew what a Consecration was. But what saith he in his Chronicles? Not a word, either of the feigned Consecration at the Nagges head, or of the true Consecration at Lambeth. But he told it to many persons by word of mouth, that the Story of the Nagges head was very true. If he did, he lied notoriously

to many persons, but we acquit him of that calumny: let it rest upon them, who think it a meritorious Act, to advance religion by any means true or false, we are too well acquainted with their hearsay reports. They who dare wrest his printed workes, ought not to be trusted what he spake by word of mouth, to some body, whom no body knowes. Their Authour saith *to some persons*, they say *to many persons*, thus this snowball increaseth. *John Stowe* is now dead, and dead men do not bite: yet let us know to whom he said it? Doctor *Champney* tells us, *they are timorous and would not be named*. Good reason, for they have no names: so *John Stow* is a silent witness, and they are namelesse witnesses.

So much for the man: now for the thing I give three answers; First if *John Stow* were a lover of the truth, he should rather have set down the *Nagges head* Ordination (if there was any such thing) then the *Lambeth* Ordination. Men would suppose the *Lambeth* Ordination of themselves, where nothing is said to the contrary, it is presumed for the Law: but the *Nagges head* Consecration, had been such a Consecration, as never was before, never will follow after.

Secondly, their Authours wrest *John Stow*

Stow abhominably. He was no profest writer of Ecclesiasticall Annales. It is true, he mentioneth the Consecration of Cardinall Pole, whether it was his respect to his Eminence, as being a neare Kinsman to the Queen, a Cardinall, the Popes Legate, and his grand Minister for the reconciliation of England, or because a toy tooke him in the head: but not with so many particulars as the Fathers intimate; all he saith is this, *the 21 of March Dr. Cranmer Archbishop of Canterbury was burnt at Oxford, the same day Cardinall Pole sang his first Masse at Greenwich in the Friars Church, on Sunday next he was Consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury (here was speedy worke), and the 25 of March received the Pall with the usuall Ceremonies at Bowes Church in Cheape.* Here is another Nagges head meeting; where he was Consecrated, by whom, after what Form, he leaveth the Reader to presume: but of all the other Consecrations performed in Queen *Maries* time, this diligent Authour mentioneth not so much as one; of all the Consecrations in Queen Elizabeths time, I think not one; of all the Consecrations in England since the Conquest, not one, or so rarely that they are not to be taken notice of. If the Argument of these Fathers were of any value

John Stow mentioneth not his Consecration at *Lambeth*, therefore he was not Consecrated there, we never had a Consecration in *England*, since the Conquest, but *Cardinal Poles*: for he mentioneth none but that which I remember, I am sure if he mention any it is most rarely. If the Fathers argument were good, Archbishop *Parker* was never elected, nor confirmed, because his Election and Confirmation are not recorded by *John Stow*: but all our Records Civil as well as Ecclesiasticall do testify the Contrary.

Lastly, if the Fathers would lay aside their prejudice, there is enough in *John Stowes Annales*, to discover the falshood of their lying Fable of the Consecration at the *Nagges head*. By their account the *Nagges head* Consecration was September 7. Anno 1559, but after this in relating the solemne Obsequies kept in *St. Pauls Church*, for the French King, *John Stow* calleth him, Dr. *Parker Arch-Bishop of Canterbury Elect*, therefore the *Nagges head* Consecration is a lying Fable; if he was still Elect, he was not then Consecrated. But afterward speaking of his Death May 17. 1575, which is the next time I find him mentioned, he stileth him the right Reverend Fa-
ther

ther in God Matthew Parker Dr. of Divi-
nity Archbishop of Canterbury. Here is no more
 the word *Elect*, for after Confirmation and
 Consecration, the word *Elect* ceaseth, here
 he is complete *Archbishop of Canterbury.*

They say, *they who make no Conscience to
 falsify Scripture will forge Records: And how
 notoriously the English Clergy have falsified
 Scripture, is Demonstrated by Gregory Mar-
 tin.* I hope none of us did ever attempt to
 purge *St. Pauls Epistles*, because there
 were in them, *Quadam male sonantia, Some-
 things that sounded not well,* in the point of lu-
 stification. We desire good words, untill
 they be able to prove their allegation. Ra-
 ther then be accounted falsifiers of Scrip-
 ture, we are contented to stand to the
 vulgar Latin, in any Controversy between
 them and us. But who is the man doth
 accuse us of so many Falsifications? One
Gregory Martin, one of their fellowes,
 whose censure we do not weigh a button.
 This is a new Inartificiall Kind of ar-
 guing, from the Authority of their own
 Writers.

But they use it much, so it followeth in
 the next words, *it is want of Charity to think
 that Stapleton, Harding, Bristow and the
 rest of the English Catholick Doctors, who did*

for sake all at home for Conscience sake, would publish to the world in print, the Nullity of Parkers Ordination; thereby engaging posterity to commit so many damnable Sacrileges, in reordaining those who had been validly ordeined already, without due examination of the matter. This plea is much like that of the old Roman, that his Adversary, did not receive the wound with his whole body, that he might have killed him fairly. They would have us rather put up the losse of our Holy Orders, then the skill of their Doctors should be questioned. If Reordination be damnable Sacrilege, the Authority of your own Doctors may be a fit *medium* to convince yourselves of Sacrilege, not us of the Invalidity of our Ordination. I hope Stephen the sixth and Sergius the third, two Popes, were other manner of men then your English Doctors, and did both pretend to examine the matter as duely, and to be as averse from damnable Sacrilege as you, yet they decreed publickly, and most unjustly, (as you yourselves doe now confesse) that all the holy Orders received from *Formosus* were void, and compelled all those who had been ordeined by him, to be reordained. *Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. cap. 12.*

Mr. Mason cited the Testimony of a
wit.

witnesse beyond all exception, *Charles Howard* Earle of *Nottingham*, Lord High Admirall of *England*, who acknowledged Archbishop *Parker* to be his Kinsman, and that he was an invited Guest at his Cōsecration at *Lambeth*. To this the Fathers reply, *If this were true, it proves onely that there was a good Dinner at Lambeth, which might well be to conceale the shamefull Consecration at the Nagges head.* It proves there was a good Consecration, as well as a good Dinner, the words are to honour his Consecration, and the solemnity thereof with his presence. It had been something uncivill, to encumber the Tavern with a Consecration, and not stay dinner there. The Earle was invited to the Consecration, at *Lambeth*, therefore it was at *Lambeth*, The Earle was not at the *Nagges head*; Mr. *Neale* himself, who see more then ever was acted, or so much as thought of, did not see that. Is it the Custom when one is invited to a Consecration, to come after it is done to dinner: or to invite a Nobleman to a Consecration in one place, and then be consecrated in another? This had been so farre from concealing the shamefullnesse of such a brainfick Consecration, that it been a ready meanes to divulge it to all the world.

They

They adde , *Besides we must take the Earles Friends word for the Earles Testimony , and Mr. Masons word for his namelesse Friend. That is none of Mr. Masons fault, but Mr. Holymoods, Mr. Constables, Mr. Sacroboscies, Dr. Champneys, Mr. Fitz Herberts, Mr Fitz-Simons, who first broached this odious Fable. Mr. Mason published this relation to the world in print while the Earle was yet living, on purpose that they might enquire and satisfy themselves ; if they did not , they can blame no body but themselves ; if they did by themselves or their Friends , (as it is most likely they did) it is evident the answer did not content them, and so we never heard more of them since. It had been the greatest folly in the world to allege the Testimony of such a Noble man in his Life time, contrary to his own knowledge , which might have been disproved from his own Authority , and so have easily laid Mr. Mason flat upon his back. You may remember your own case with the Bishop of Durham. But it was too true to be contradicted then , and too late to be Contradicted now.*

They say , they bring more then one witnesse of the Nagges head Consecration, Pardop me, You never produced one yet, and which is lesse then producing, you never so much

as named a witnesse, whilst he himself was living. In or about the yeare 1603. you first named *Mr. Neale* and innocent *John Stow*, when they were both dead; you might as well have named the man in the *Moone* as *John Stow*. Onely I confesse you named the *Bishop of Durham* in his life time, and you see what is the issue of it: and if you had named the others in their life times, you must have expected a like issue, either the perpetuall infamy of your witnesse, or the utter confusion of your Cause. You speake much of the learning, and virrue, and judgement of your hear-say Witnesses, who knew how to distinguish between an *Episcopall Consecration*, and a banquet. I hope you doe not meane that the *Earle of Nottingham* did not know, how to distinguish between a banquet and a Consecration, if he did not, the High Admirallship of England was ill committed to him; or that he had not as much regard to his honour and Conscience, as any of your Priests. We meddle not with their Learning and virrue, but we are no more obliged to take their Testimonies upon hear-say, then they would take our Testimonies. They have give an account to God, and know before this time whether they have

have done well or ill.

They proceed, *The Priests and Iesuits*, to whom the Records were shewed in King James his time, protested against them as forged and improbable, as appeareth by the Testimony of men yet living, whose honesty cannot be called in question. Faiber Faircloth, one of the imprisoned Iesuits, testified so much to many by word of mouth and in writing. Where is the writing? where is the protestation? why are they not produced? Still here are no proofes but upon Hearsay. One eye Witnesse is worth an hundred such, who can sweare to no more but that they heard it, and God knowes through how many Hucksters hands. I hope the Bishop of *Durhams* case will make them more wary for the future.

But they are angry with some Protestants, who endeavour to make this well grounded story a meer Fable, and thereby call many persons of much more learning, viriue, and prudence then themselves Fooles or knaves. We are plain *Macedonians*, who call a Fable a Fable, without either welt or gard: yea, so notorious a Fable, that (but that you tellus the Contrary), we could not believe that any one of you did ever give any credit to it your selves; any more then the *Athenians* did believe those monstrous Fables of Bulls and

and Minotaures , which themselves had raised , because some of their eminent Citizens had devised it or related it : But we call no men *Fooles* or *Knanes*, That language is too unmannerly for civill Writers. What new Topick is this, because we cannot beleieve a mans relation or his Iudgement, do we straightway call him *Foole* or *Knave*? Excuse me. there are credulity , and prejudice, and mistakes , and pious frauds in the world, and none of these will willingly weare the Livery of *Knaves* or *Fooles*. We are not of the same mind with Pope *Stephen* and Pope *Sergius*, for the reordeining of those , who had been ordeined by *Formosus* , yet we do not call them *knaves* or *Fooles*. We cannot beleieve what you yourselves have related of my Lord of *Durham* , yet we are not guilty of such extravagant expressions.

CAP.

CAP. IX.

The Fathers insist too much upon the Authority of their own party, Why Consecration is not mentioned at Restitution, The exactnesse of our Records justified.

IT seemeth to me, that the Fathers insist too much upon the honesty, and virtue, and learning of their own party: In dispute with an Adversary, virtue is like fire, which preserveth it self by being covered with ashes: but spread abroad by ostentation, it is quickly extinguished; especially Comparisons are odious, and beget altercation. We say, there is not a Hill so high in *Lincolnshire*, but there is another within a Mile as high as it: take you the reputation of learning and prudence, so you leave us the better cause; and we shall be able to defend it well enough against you. But the maine defect in this part of your discourse is this, the Bishop of *Chalcedon* confesseth of Mr. *Oldcorn*, one of your Order, that he acknowledged these Records to be Authentick, and the rest of the
 impri-

imprisoned Priests, who viewed the Records, are charged publicly in print to have done the same, by Bishop Goodwin, by Mr. Mason; every thing ought to be unloosed the same way it is bound. They were all Schollars and could write, if this charge were not true, they ought to have published a Protestation to the world in print to the contrary, whilest their Adversaries were living, whilest the Witnesses were living: but now after they and their Adversaries, and the witnesses are all so long dead, to talke of a verball protestation to some of their Friends, upon hearsay, signifieth nothing.

Now we must make another winding, and return to Bishop *Barlow*; but I hold to the clue, in hope at length to get out of this fictitious Labyrinth. *Henry the 8. Letters Patents, vvhereby Bishop Barlow vvvas installed in (they would say restored to) the Temporalities of his Bishoprick, make mention of his acceptation and Confirmation, but none of his Consecration. why should this last be omitted, if he were really consecrated?* This objectiō sheweth nothing, but the unskilfulnesse of the Fathers in our English Customes and Forms.

O

Let

Let them compare all the restitutions of their friends to their Temporalities in England, as *Cardinall Poles*, *Bishop Gardiners* and the rest, and they shall find the Form the very same with *Bishop Barlowes*; I hope they will not conclude thence that none of them were consecrated. The reason of the Forme is very prudent, In a Restitution to Temporalities, they take no notice of any Acts that are purely Spirituall, as Consecration is: but onely of such Acts as are Temporall, as Acceptation and Confirmation.

But if he was restored to his Temporalities not being Consecrated, he might also sit in Parliament without Consecration. The Assumption is understood, but *Bishop Barlow* was restored to his Temporalities without Consecration; which is most false. From the Conversion of the Nation untill this Day, they are not able to produce one instance, of one Bishop, who was duely Elec^ted, duely confirmed, and duely restored to his Temporalities by the Kings Mandate, without Consecration, or did sit in Parliament without Consecration. He must sit in Parliament in his Episcopall habit, but that cannot be before Consecration. It seemeth they think that Bishops sit in Parliament, as Temporal

porall Barons : but it a great mistake, Bishops sate in the Great Councells of the Kingdome, before the names of Parliament or Barons were heard of in *England*.

They bring an Argument from *the exactnesse of our Records*, and that connexion that is between Records of one Court and another. The first thing necessary to obtain a Bishoprick in *England*, is the Kings *Conge d'eslire*; that appears in the Rolles. Next, the actuall Election; that appears in the Records of the Dean and Chapter. Thirdly, the Kings Acceptation of the Election, and his Commission to the Archbishop, or four Bishops in the Vacancy, to Confirm the Election and Consecrate the person Elected and Confirmed legally; that appears in the Letters Patents enrolled. Fourthly, the Confirmation of the Election before the Dean of the Arches, but by the Archbishops appointment, (this is performed alwaies in *Bow Church*, except extraordinarily it be performed elsewhere by Commission); this appears in the Records of the Archbishop. Fifthly, the Consecration it self by the Archbishop and other Bishops, or other Bishops without him by virtue of his Commission; this appears in the Records of the Prothonothary of the See

of Canterbury. Lastly the Restitution of the Temporalties; which appears in the Rolles, and his Enthronisation in the Records of the Dean and Chapter. Every one of these takes another by the hand, and he who will enjoy a Bishoprick in *England*, must have them all. The Chapter cannot elect without the Kings *Conge d'Esire*. The King never grants his Letters Patents for Confirmation and Consecration, untill he have a Certificate of the Deā and Chapters Electiō. The Dean of the *Arches* never confirms, untill he have the Kings Commission. The Archbishop never Consecrates untill the Election be confirmed. And lastly the King never receiveth Homage for the Bishoprick, or giveth the Temporalties, nor the Deā and Chapter Enthroned, untill after Consecration. He that hath any one of these acts, must of Necessity have all that goe before it in this Method; and he that hath the last, hath them all. But this was more then Mr. Neale, or whosoever was Inventioner of that silly Fable, did understād, otherwise he would have framed a more possible relatiō.

Hence they argue, The Records *being so exact*, how is it possible that no Copies of Barlowes Consecration do appeare in any Court or Bishoprick of England? They mistake the matter wholly, the Consecration ought not to

ap-

appeare in any Court but one, that is that Registry where he was Consecrated, which being not certainly known, at so great a distance of time, is not so easily found, and I believe was never sought for yet further than *Lambeth*. But all the other Acts doe appeare in their proper Courts; The Kings License, the Dean and Chapters Election, the Kings Letters Patents, the Confirmation of the Dean of the Arches, which all goe before Consecration; and his doing Homage, and the Restitution of him to his Temporalties, and his Enthronisation, all which do follow the Consecration, and are infallible proofes in Law of the Consecration: as likewise his sitting in Parliament, his Ordaining of Priests, his Consecrating of Bishops, his letting of Leases, his receiving of Hereditaments to him and his Successours, his exchanging of Lands; all which are as irrefragable proofes of his Consecration, as any man hath to prove that such persons were his Parents, either Father or Mother. And when the right Register is sought, which must be by the help of the Court of Faculties, I doubt not but his Consecration will be found in the proper place, as all the rest are.

Mr. Mason alleged, that Bishop *Gardiners* Consecration was not to be found in the Register of *Lambeth*, any more then Bi-

shop *Barlowes*: yet no man doubted of his Ordination. They answer first, that Mr. Mason did not seek so solicitously or diligently for *Bishop Gardiners Consecration*, as for *Bishop Barlowes*. Then why do not they whom it doth concern, cause more diligent search to be made? without finding the Records of *Bishop Gardiners Consecration*, they cannot accule *Bishop Barlow* of want of Consecration, upon that onely reason. Secondly they answer, that if *Gardiners Consecration*, were as doubtful as *Barlowes* and *Parkers*, they would take the same advise they give us, to repaire with speed to some other Church of undoubted Clergy. Yes, where will they find a more undoubted Clergy? They may goe further and fare worse. *Rome* itself hath not more exact Records, nor a more undoubted Succession, then the Church of *England*. There is no reason in the world to doubt either of *Archbishop Parkers Consecration*, or *Bishop Gardiners*, or *Bishop Barlowes*. Neither doth his Consecration concern us so much, at the Fathers imagine: there were three Consecraters (which is the Canonickall number) besides him.

It is high time for the Fathers to wind up, and draw to a Conclusion of this Argument. That which followeth next is too high and

and can scarcely be tolerated ; to accuse the publick Records and Archives of the Kingdome, and to insinuate the Primates and Metropolitans of England of Forgery, upon no ground but their own Imaginatio. I doubt whether they durst offer it to a widow Woman. *As to the impossibility of forging so many Registers, in case there be so many, it is easily answered, that it is no more then that the Consecraters and other persons concerned, should have conspired to give in a false Certificate, that the Consecration was performed with all due Cerimonies and Rites, and thereby deceive the Courts or make them dissemble.* Should any man accuse the Generall of their order, or one of their Provincials, or but the Rector of one of their Colleges, of Forgery and counterfeiting the publick Records of the Order ; how would they storm, and thunder, and mingle heaven and earth together and cry out, *No moderate or prudent persons can suspect that such persons should damne their soules, that so many pious learned Divines should engage themselves and their posterity, in damnable Sacrileges, without feare of damnation.*

If a man will not believe every ridiculous Fable, which they tell by word of mouth upon hearsay, they call persons of more *vir-tue learning and prudence* than themselves, *Fooles and Knaves*; But they may insinuate the principall Fathers of our Church, of certifying most pernicious lyes under their hands and seales, not for a piece of bread, which is a poore temptatiō, but for nothing, that is to make them both *Fooles and Knaves*. Is not this blowing hot and cold with the same breath? *or to have the Faith of our Lord Iesus Cbrist with respect of persons?* Compare the politicall principles of the Church of *England* with your own, and try if you can find any thing so pernicious to mankind and all humane Society, in ours more than in yours. Compare the Case Theology of the Church of *England*, with your own, and try if you can find any thing so destructive to Morality, to truth, and Iustice, and Conscience, as might lead us to perpetrate such Crimes more than yourselves. We are not affraid of a Paralell. You profess great endeavours to make Profelites; we do not condemne Zeale, yet wish you had more light with it: even in prudence, which you yourselves extoll, this is not your right Course, to follow those Birds, with noise and clamour, which you desire to catch,

In

In summe, your answer or solution is full of ignorant mistakes. It confoundeth Civill Rolles and Ecclesiasticall Registers. It supposeth that our Records are but transcriptions, one out of another; whereas every Court recordeth its own Acts, and keeps itself within its own bounds. It taketh notice but of one Consecrater: where as we have alwaies three at the least, many times five or six. It quite forgetteth publick Notaries, which must be present at every Consecration with us, to draw up what is done into Acts; with us every one of these Notaries when he is admitted to that charge, doth take a solemne Oath upon his knees to discharge his Office faithfully, that is, not to make false Certificates. Secondly, it is absurd and unseasonable, to enquire how a thing came to passe that never was: you ought First to have proved, that our Records were forged, and then it had been more seasonable to have enquired modestly, how it came to passe. Thirdly, it is incredible, that persons of such prudence and eminence, should make false Certificates under their hands and seales, to the utter ruine of themselves and all that had a hand it, and no advantage to any person breathing. It is incredible that those
Records

Records should be counterfeited in a corner, which were avowed publickly for Authentick by the whole Parliament of *England* in the 8 year of Queen *Elisabeth*; which were published to the world in print by the person most concerned, as if he dared all the world to except against them: and yet no man offered to except against them then. Fourthly, it is impossible to give in a false Certificate of a Consecration which was never performed in *England*, (especially at *Lambeth*) before lesse then thousands of eye witnesses: and that at *Lambeth*, in the Face of the Court and Westminster Hall. Surely they thinke we consecrate in Closets, or holes, or haymowes. They may even as well say that the publick Acts of our Parliaments are counterfeited, and the publick Acts of our Synods are counterfeited, and all our publick monuments counterfeited. It is none of the honestest Pleas, *Negare factum*, to deny such publick Acts as these. Fifthly, this answer is pernicious to mankind, it is destructive to all Societies of men, that Bishops of so great eminence, should conspire with publick Notaries, to give in false Certificates, in a matter of such High Consequence as Holy Orders are, without any temptation,
with

without any hope of Advantage to themselves or others. It affordeth a large Seminary for jealousies and suspicions. It exterminateth all credit and confidence out of the world, and instructeth all men to trust nothing, but what they see with their eyes. Lastly, it is contradictory to themselves; They have told us, I know not how often, and tell us again in this Paragraph, That if the Nagges head Consecration had been false, they might have convinced it by a thousand witnesses: Here they make it an easy thing, for the Consecraters and other persons concerned, to conspire together to give in a false Certificate, that the Consecration was performed with all due Ceremonies and Rites, and thereby deceive the Courts or make them dissemble. If the world will be deceived so, it is but right and reason that it be deceived; to be deceived by a false Certificate, that may be convinced by a thousand witnesses, is selfdeceit.

But they say, *this is more possible and more probable, then that all the Clergy should conspire not to produce the same Registers, when they were so hardly pressed by their Adversaries.* These are but empty pretenses, there was no pressing to produce Registers, nor any thing objected that did deserve the production of

of a Register. That which was objected against our Orders in those dayes was about the Form of Ordination published by Edward the sixth, and the Legality of our Ordination in the time of Queen *Elisabeth*; the *Nagges head* Consecration was never objected in those dayes. Besides, Registers are Publick enough themselves, and need no production; and yet our Registers were produced, produced by the Parliament 8 *Elisab.* who cited them as authentick Records, produced and published to the world in Print, that was another production.

They adde, *Or that so many Catholicks should have been so foolish to invent or mainein the Story of the Nagges head, in such a time when if it had been false, they might have been convinced by a thousand Witnessers.* Feare them not, they were wiser then to publish such a notorious Fable in those dayes; they might perchance whisper it in Corners among themselves, but the boldest of them durst not maintain it, or object it in print, for feare of shame and disgrace. It was folly to give any eare to it, but it was knavery to invent it: and to doe it after such a bungling manner, (whosoever was the Inventer) was knavery and Folly complicated together.

If the Fathers write any more upon this subject, I desire them to bring us no more *hearesay* testimonies of their owne party; whatsoever esteeme they may have themselves, of their judgment, and prudence, and impartiality. It is not the manner of Polemick writers to urge the authority of their owne Doctors to an Adversary, or allege the moderne practise of their present Church. We have our owne Church and our owne Doctors as well as they. If we would pinne our faith to the sleeves of their Writers, and submit to their judgments, and beleve all their reportes, and let all things be as they would have it, we needed not to have any more controversy with them; but we might well raise a worse controversy in our selves with our owne consciences,

CAT.

CHA. XI.

Of our formes of Episcopall and priestly ordination, of Zuinglianism, of Arch Bishop Lavvd, of ceremonies. Our assurance of our Orders.

WE have done with the Nagges head for the present. That which followeth next doth better become Schollers, as having more shew of truth and reality in it. They object that in *all the Catholick Rituals, not onely of the west but of the East, there is not one forme of consecrating Bishops, that hath not the word Bishops in it, or some other words expressing the particular authority and power of a Bishop distinctly. But in our Consecration, there is not one word to expresse the difference and power of Episcopacy. For these vvordes [receive the holy Ghost] are indifferent to priesthood and Episcopacy, and used in both Ordinations.* I answer, that the forme of Episcopall Ordination used at the same time when hands are imposed, is the same both in their forme and ours, [*Receive the holy Ghost*]. And if these words be considered singly

singly in a divided sense from the rest of the Office, there is nothing either in our forme or theirs which doth distinctly and reciprocally expresse Episcopall power and Authority. But if these words be considered coniointly in a compounded sense, there is enough to expresse Episcopall power and authority distinctly, and as much in our forme as theirs.

First two Bishops present the Bishop elect to the Arch-Bishop of the Province, with these words, *most Reverend Father in Christ, we present to you this godly and learned man to be Consecrated Bishop.* There is one expression.

Then the Arch-Bishop causeth the Kings Letters Patents to be produced and read, which require the Arch Bishop to consecrate him a *Bishop*. There is a second expression.

Thirdly the new Bishop takes his oath of canonicall obedience. *I A B elected Bishop of the Church and See of C. do professe and promise all reverence and due obedience to the Arch Bishop and Metropolitane Church of D. and his Successours. So God help me &c.* This is a third Expression.

Next the Arch Bishop exhorts the whole Assembly to solemne praier for this person thus elected and presented, before they

they admit him to that office (that is the Office of a Bishop,) whereunto they hope he is called. by the holy Ghost, after the example of Christ before he did chuse his Apostles, and the church of Antioch before they laid hands upon Paul and Barnabas, This is a fourth expresseion.

Then followeth the *Litany*, wherein there is this expresse petition for the person to be ordeined Bishop, *we beseech thee to give thy blessing and grace to this our brother elected Bishop, that he may discharge that office whereunto he is called diligently to the Edification of thy Church.* To which all the congregation answer, *Heare us O Lord we beseech thee.* Here is a fifth expresseion.

Then followeth this praier wherewith the *Litany* is concluded. *Allmighty God, the giver of all good things, which by thy holy Spirit hast constituted diverse orders of Ministers in thy Church, vouchsafewe beseech thee to looke graciously upon this thy servant, now called to the Office of a Bishop.* This is a sixth expresseion.

Next the Arch-Bishop telleth him he must examine him, before he admit him to that administratiō whereunto he is called, and maketh a solemne praier for him, that *God who hath constituted some Prophets, some Apostles &c. to the Edification of his Church,*

Church, would grant to this his servant the grace to use the authority committed to him, to edification not destruction, to distribute food in due season to the family of Christ, as becometh a faithfull and prudent Steward. This authority can be no other then Episcopall authority, nor this Stewardship any other thing then Episcopacy. This is a seveth expressed.

Then followeth imposition of hands, by the Arch-Bishop and all the Bishops present, with these words. Receive the holy Ghost &c: and lastly the tradition of the Bible into his hands, exhorting him to behave himself towards the flock of Christ, as a Pastour, not devouring but feeding the flock. All this implieth Episcopall authority. They may except against Christs owne forme of ordeining his Apostles if they will, and against the forme used by their owne Church: but if they be sufficient formes, our forme is sufficient. This was the same forme which was used in Edward the sixth time, and we have seen how Cardinall Pole and Paul the fourth confirmed all without exception, that were ordeined according to this forme; so they would reunite themselves to the Roman Catholick Church.

They bring the very same objection against our Priestly Ordination, The forme

or words whereby men are made Priests must
 expresse authority and power to consecrate, or
 make present Christs body and blood, (whether
 with or without transubstantiation is not the pre-
 sent controversy with Protestants.) Thus far
 we accorde, to the truth of the presence of
 Christs body and blood; So they leave us
 this latitude for the manner of his presence.
 Abate us Transubstantiation, and those
 things which are consequents of their de-
 termination of the manner of presence, and
 we have no difference with them in this
 particular. They who are ordeined Priests,
 ought to have power to consecrate the
 Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ,
 that is, to make them present after such
 manner as they were present at the first in-
 stitution; whether it be done by enuncia-
 tion of the words of Christ, as it is obser-
 ved in the western Church, or by praier,
 as it is practised in the Easterne Church; or
 whether these two be both the same thing
 in effect, that is, that the formes of the Sa-
 craments be mysticall praiers and implicate
 invocations. Our Church for more abun-
 dant caution useth both formes, as well in
 the Consecration of the Sacrament, as in
 the ordination of Priests. In the holy Eucha-
 rist, our consecration is a repetition of that
 which was done by Christ, and now done
 by

by him that consecrateth in the person of Christ: otherwise the Priest could not say *this is my body*. And likewise in Episcopall Consecration, *Homo imponit manus, deus largitur gratiam, Sacerdos imponit supplicem dexteram, Deus benedicit potente dextera*: *Man imposeth hands, God conferreth grace, The Bishop imposeth his suppliant right hand, God bleisseth with his Almighty right hand*. In both consecrations Christ himself is the chiefe consecrater still, Then if power of consecratio be nothing els but power to do that which Christ did, and ordeined to be done, our Priests want not power to consecrate. They adde, in all formes of Ordeining Priests, that ever were used in the Easterne or Western Church, is expresly set downe the word Priest, or some oither words expressing the proper function and authority of Priesthood &c. The Grecians using the word Priest or Bishop in their formes, do sufficiently expresse the respective power of every Order. But our Reformers did not put into the forme of ordeining Priests, any words expressing authority to make Christs body present. I answer, that if by formes of ordeining Priests, they understād that essentiall forme of words, which is used at the same instant of time whilest hands are imposed, I denie that in all formes of Priestly ordination, the word Priest is set downe either expresly

or æquivalently. It is set downe expressly in the Easterne Church, it is not set downe expressly in the Westerne Church, Both the Easterne and Westerne formes are lawfull, but the Westerne commeth nearer to the institution of Christ.

But if by formes of Ordeining, they understand Ordinalls or Ritualls, or the intire forme of ordeining: both our Church and their Church have not onely æquivalent expressions of Priestly power, but even the expresse word *Priest* it self, which is sufficient both to direct and to expresse the intention of the Consecrater. Vnder that name the ArchDeacon presenteth them, *Right Reverend Father in Christ, I present unto you these persons here present, to be admitted to the Order of Priesthood.* Vnder that name the Bishop admitteth them, *well beloved brethren, these are they whom we purpose by the grace of God this day to admit [cooptare] into the holy office of Priesthood.* Vnder this name the whole assembly praieth for them, *Almighty God, vouchsafe we beseech thee to looke graciously upon these thy servants, which this day are called to the office of Priesthood.* It were to be wished, that writers of Controversies would make more use of their owne eyes, and trust lesse other mens citations.

Secondly I answer, that it is not necessary

ry, that the effectiall formes of Sacraments should be alwaies so very expresse and determinate, that the words are not capable of extension to any other matter: if they be as determinate and expresse, as the example and prescription of Christ, it is sufficient. The forme of baptisme is, *I baptise thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*: Not I baptise thee to *Regeneration*, or for *Remission of sins*. There are many other kinds of baptismes or washings, besides this Sacramentall baptisme: yet this forme is as large as the institution of Christ. And these generall words are efficacious both to regeneration and remission of sinnes, as well as if regeneration and remission of sins had bene expressly mentioned. In this forme of baptisme, there is enough antecedent to direct and regulate both the actions and intentions of the Minister: So there is likewise in our forme of Ordination.

Thirdly I answer, that in our very essentiall forme of Priestly Ordination, Priestly power and authority is sufficiently expressed; we need not seeke for a needle in a bottle of hay. The words of our Ordinall are cleare enough. *First Receive the Holy Ghost, (That is the grace of the holy Ghost) to exercise and discharge the Office of Priest*

hood, to which thou hast been now presented, to which thou hast been now accepted, and for which we have prayed to God, that in it thou maiest discharge thy duty faithfully and acceptably.

Secondly, in these words, *whose sins thou doest remit they are remitted*, that is not onely by Priestly absolution: but by preaching, by baptising, by administering the holy Eucharist, which is a meanes to applie the allsufficient sacrifice of Christ, for the remission of Sinnes. He who authoriseth a man to accomplish a worke, doth authorise him to use all meanes which tend to the accomplishment thereof,

That which is objected, that *Laymen have power to remit sinnes by Baptisme*, but no power to consecrate, signifieth nothing as to this point. For first their owne Doctors do acknowledge, that a *Lay man can not baptise solemnely*, nor in the presence of a Priest or a Deacon, nor in their absence, except onely in case of necessity. Saint Austin gives the reason, because no man may invade another mans office. Laymen may, and are bound to instruct others in case of necessity: yet the office of preaching and instructing others is Conferred by Ordination. The ordinary office of remitting sinnes, both by baptisme and by the holy Eucharist, doth belong to Bishops and under the to Priests.

Thirdly

Bell. de
Sac.

Bapt.

l. 1.

c. 7.

Thirdly, this Priestly power to consecrate is contained in these words, *Be thou a faithfull dispenser of the word of God, and Sacraments.* And afterwards, when the Bishop delivers the holy Bible into the hands of those who are ordeined Priests, *Have thou authority to preach the word of God, and Administer the Sacraments.* We do not deny, but Deacons have been admitted to distribute and Minister the Sacraments, by the Command or permission of Priests, or as Subservient unto them; but there is as much difference between a subserviēt distributiō of the Sacrament, and the *Dispensing* or *Administring* of it, as there is betweene the Office of a Porter who distributeth the almes at the gate, and the Office of the Steward who is the proper dispenser of it. Look to it Gentlemen; If your owne Ordination be valide, Ours is as valide, and more pure.

They make the cause of these defects in our forme of Ordination, to be, because *Zuinglianisme and Puritanisme did prevaile in the English Church in those daies.* They beleev'd not the reall presence: therefore they put no word in their forme expressing power to consecrate. They held Episcopacy and Priesthood to be one and the same thing: Therefore they put not in one word expressing the Episcopall Function. This is called leaping over the stile before
a man

a man comes at it, To devise reasons of that which never was. First prove our defects, if you can: And then find out as many reasons of them as you list. But to say the truth; the cause and the effect are well coupled together. The cause, that is the Zuinglianisme of our predecessours, never had any reall existence in the nature of things, but onely in these mēs imaginations: So the defects of our Ordinalls are not reall but imaginary. Herein the Fathers adventured to farre, to tell us that we have nothing in our formes of Ordeining, to expresse either the Priestly or Episcopall function: when every child that is able to reade can tell them, that we have the expresse words of Bishops and Priests in our Formes, over and over againe, And mainteine to all the the world that *the three Orders, of Bishops Priests and Deacons, have been ever from the beginning in the Church of Christ.*

*In pra-
fatione.*

This they say is the true reason, why Parker and his Collegues were contented with the Nagges head Consecration, (that is to say, one brainsick whimley is the reason of another): and why others recurred to extraordinary vocation in Queene Elisabeths time. Say what others? name one genuine son of the Church of England if you can? Doctor Whitakers, and Doctor Fulke, who are the onely two
men

men mentioned by you, are both professedly against you. Doctor Whitakers saith *we do not condemne all the Order of Bishops, as he falsely slanders us, but onely the false Bishops of the Church of Rome.* And Doctor Fulke, *for Order and seemely government among the Clergy, there was allwaies one Principall, to whom the name of Bishop or Superintendent hath been applied, which roome Titus exercised in Crete, Timothy in Ephesus, others in other Places.* *De Eccl. cles. cont. 2. q. 5 c. 3.* In Timothy, that the Ordination, or Consecration, by imposition of hands, was alwaies principally committed to him.

The Fathers proceed, *If Mr. Lawd had found successe in his first attempts, it is very credible, he would in time have reformed the Forme of the English Ordination.* That pious and learned Prelate wanted not other degrees in Church and Schooles, which they omit. He was a great lover of peace, but too judicious to dance after their pipe, too much versed in Antiquity to admit their new matter and forme, or to attempt to correct the *Magnificat* for satisfaction of their humours. But whence had they this credible Relation? We are very confident, they have neither Authour nor ground for it, but their owne imagination. And if it be so, what excuse they have for it in their Case Divinity, they know best: but in ours we could not excuse it from down right calumny.

They

They have such an eye at our order and uniformity, that they can not let our *long Cloakes and Surplesses* alone. We never had any such animosities among us about our Cloakes, as some of their Religious Orders have had about their gownes: both for the colour of them, whether they should be black, or white, or gray, or the naturall Colour of the sheep; And for the fashion them, whether they should belong or short &c, in so much as two Popes successively could not determine it.

If Mr. *Mason* did commend the wisdom of the English Church, for paring away superfluous Ceremonies in Ordination, he did well. Ceremonies are advancements of Order, decency, modesty, and gravity in the service of God, Expressions of those heavenly desires and dispositions, which we ought to bring along with us to Gods house, Adjuments of attention and devotion, Furtherances of Edification, visible instructors, helps of Memory, exercises of faith, the shell that preserves the Kernell of Religion from contempt, the leaves that defend the blossomes and the fruite; but if they grow over thick and ranke, they hinder the fruite from comming to maturity, and then the Gardiner pluckes them of. There is great difference between

tween the hearty expressions of a faithfull Friend, and the mimicall gestures of a fawning flatterer; betweē the unaffected comeliness of a grave Marrone, and the phantasticall paintings, and patchings, and powderings, of a garish Curtesān.

When Ceremonies become burthensome by excessive superfluity, or unlawfull Ceremonies are obtruded, or the Substance of divine worship is placed in Circumstances, or the service of God is more respected for humane ornaments then for the Divine Ordinance; it is high time to pare away excesses, and reduce things to the ancient meane.

These Fathers are quite out, where they make it lawfull at some times to adde, but never to pare away: yet we have pared away nothing, which is either prescribed or practised by the true Catholick Church. If our Ancestors have pared away any such things out of any mistake, (which we do not beleeve,) let it be made appeare evidently to us, and we are more ready to welcome it againe at the fore-dore, then our Ancestours were to cast it out at the back-dore. *Errare possumus haeretici esse nolumus.*

To conclude, as an impetuous wind doth not blow downe those trees which are well
radicated

radicated, but causeth them to spread their rootes more firmly iu the earth: so these concussions of our Adversaries, do confirme us in the undoubted assurance of the truth, and validity, and legality of our holy Orders. We have no more reason to doubt of the truth of our Orders, because of the different judgment of an handfull of our partiall countrymen, and some few forreine Doctors misinformed by them; then they themselves have to doubt of the truth of their Orders who were ordeined by *Formosus*, because two Popes *Stephen* and *Sergius* one after another, out of passion and prejudice, declared them to be voide and invalide.

But supposing that which we can never grant, without betraying both our selves and the truth, that there were some remote probabilities, that might occasion suspicion in some persons prepossessed with prejudice, of the legality of our Orders: yet for any man upon such pretended uncerteinties, to leave the communion of that Church wherein he was baptised, which gave him his Christian being, and to Apostate to them, where he shall meet with much greater grounds of feare, both of Schisme and Idolatry; were to plöge himself in a certein crime, for feare of

an uncertein danger.

Here the Fathers make a brieffe repetition of whatsoever they have said before in this discourse, (either out of distrust of the Readers memory, or confidence of their owne atchievements,) of the *Nagges head*, and *Mr. Neale*, and the Protestant writers, and Bishop *Bancroft*, and Bishop *Morton* and the other Bishops that sat with him the last Parliament, (which being the onely thing alleged by them in the Authours life time, and proved so undeniably to be false, is enough to condemne all the rest of their *Hearsay* reports, for groundlesse fables) of our Registers, of King *Edwards* Bishops, of Bishop *Barlow*, and of the forme of our ordination; Directing him who will cleare all those doubtres, what he hath to do, as if we were their Iournymen. Let them not trouble themselves about that, they are cleared to the least graine.

But if they will receive advise for advise, and pursue a prudentiall course which they prescribe to others; if they regard the present face of the skie, and looke well to their owne interest, and the present conjuncture of their affaires; they have more need and are more ingaged in reputation to defend themselves, then to oppugne others.

So they conclude their discourse with
this

this short Corollary, *How unfortunately was Charles the first late King of England, misinformed in matter of his Bishops and Clergy? what scruple could he have had, if he had known the truth, to give way to the Parliament, to pull downe Parliament Bishops, who were so farre from being de jure divino, that they were not so much as de jure Ecclesiastico?* We thanke you Gentlemen for your good will, The Orthodox Clergy of England are your feare. And you know what commonly followeth after feare, Hate, *Oderunt quos metuntur*. What pitty it is that you were not of King Charles his Councell, to have advised him better? yet we observe few Princes thrive worse, then where you pretend to be great ministers. If you had counsailed him upon this Subject, perhaps you might have found him too hard for you; as another did whose heart he burst with downe right reason. If ever that innocent King had a finger in the blood of any of that party, that was it, to choake a man with reason; but certeinly that wise Prince would not have much regarded your positive conclusions, upon hearfay premisses.

We hold our Benefices by human right, our offices of Priests and Bishops both by divine right and humane right. But put the case we did hold our Bishopricks onely
by

by humane right, Is it one of your cases of conscience, that a Sovereigne Prince may justly take away from his Subjects any thing which they hold by humane right? If one man take from another that which he holds justly by the law of man, he is a thief and a robber by the law of God. Let us alter the case a little, from our Bishoppes to their Colleges or their treasures: If any man should attempt to take them from them, upon this ground because they held them but by humane right, they would quickly cry out with *Ploiden*, *the case is altered*. Be our right divine, or humane, or both, if we be not able to defend it against any thing the Fathers can bring against it, we deserve to lose it.

FINIS.